


APPLICATION COVER SHEET
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

Legal Name of Applicant: Rhode Island Department of Elementary and Secondary Education	Applicant's Mailing Address: Shepard Building 255 Westminster Street Providence, RI 02903-3400
State Contact for the School Improvement Grant Name: Colleen Hedden Position and Office: Title I Coordinator Office for Diverse Learners Contact's Mailing Address: Shepard Building 255 Westminister Street Providence, RI 02903-3400 Telephone: (401) 222-8939 Fax: (401) 222-6030 Email address: colleen.hedden@ride.ri.gov	
Chief State School Officer (Printed Name): Deborah A. Gist, Commissioner	Telephone: (401) 222-8706
Signature of the Chief State School Officer: X 	Date: May 7, 2010
<p>The State, through its authorized representative, agrees to comply with all requirements applicable to the School Improvement Grants program, including the assurances contained herein and the conditions that apply to any waivers that the State receives through this application.</p>	

PART I: SEA REQUIREMENTS

As part of its application for a School Improvement Grant under section 1003(g) of the ESEA, an SEA must provide the following information.

A. **ELIGIBLE SCHOOLS:** An SEA must provide a list, by LEA, of each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school in the State. (A State's Tier I and Tier II schools are its persistently lowest-achieving schools and, if the SEA so chooses, certain additional Title I eligible schools that are as low achieving as the State's persistently lowest-achieving schools or that have had a graduation rate below 60 percent over a number of years.) In providing its list of schools, the SEA must indicate whether a school has been identified as a Tier I or Tier II school solely because it has had a graduation rate below 60 percent over a number of years. In addition, the SEA must indicate whether it has exercised the option to identify as a Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III school a school that was made newly eligible to receive SIG funds by the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010.

Along with its list of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, the SEA must provide the definition that it used to develop this list of schools. If the SEA's definition of persistently lowest-achieving schools that it makes publicly available on its Web site is identical to the definition that it used to develop its list of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, it may provide a link to the page on its Web site where that definition is posted rather than providing the complete definition.

Please see Appendix A for Rhode Island's definition of "Persistently Lowest- Achieving Schools," and Appendix B for the list of Tier I, Tier II and Tier III schools.

Based on its approved definition of "persistently lowest- achieving schools," the RIDE anticipates that we will have six schools in Tier I, five schools in Tier II, and thirty-two schools in Tier III. The complete list of schools is also in Appendix B.

INTRODUCTION

On January 7th 2010, the Rhode Island Board of Regents approved *The Strategic Plan For Transforming Education in Rhode Island* (The Strategic Plan). The Strategic Plan is designed to prepare all students for success through world-class standards and assessments, user-friendly data systems, equitable and effective investments, great schools, and excellent educators. The Strategic Plan is aligned with US ED's focus for reform and with the intents and purposes of the 1003(g) School Improvement Grants (SIG). As such, each LEA that is awarded SIG funds will undertake work in its Tier I and Tier II schools that is highly focused and intensive, while utilizing other resources to simultaneously raise all of its schools to the levels set forth in The Strategic Plan.

The *Basic Education Program Regulations* (BEP), approved by the Board of Regents June 4th 2009 to take effect July 1st 2010, is aligned with the intents and purposes of the 1003(g) School Improvement Grants. The BEP details what LEAs must do to support schools, specifying that: “At all levels of the LEA system, leadership shall focus on student learning and development and create educational environments conducive to learning” and “The primary method for leadership to achieve the focus on student learning is the management of a continuous improvement process,” which consists of the following five elements:

1. Collect relevant qualitative and quantitative data to assess performance in relation to measurable expectations;
2. Use available data to measure gaps in current performance of students, educators, and systems against state standards;
3. Develop and disseminate integrated school and LEA level plans that clearly describe what each person involved in the plan should do;
4. Implement improvement plans with fidelity and sufficient resources, including time; and
5. Monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of improvement efforts using relevant qualitative and quantitative data and make such reports publicly available.

Recently, the Rhode Island Department of Education (the RIDE) also issued *The Protocol for Interventions: Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools* (The Protocol; see Appendix C). The Protocol guides the LEAs responsible for Rhode Island’s persistently lowest-achieving schools in the implementation of one of the four School Intervention Models. It sets expectations for measures of performance, and outlines how to enhance school-level capacity to accelerate improvement and engage families and the community in the change process. The Protocol emphasizes that under no circumstances will persistently lowest-achieving schools be allowed to continue to operate under status quo conditions.

The Protocol places the responsibility upon the LEA to hold its schools accountable for continuous improvement of instructional and support systems that advance equity and access to opportunities for students’ high achievement. This serves to further Rhode Island’s commitment to closing inequitable gaps in performance and achievement, especially the gaps correlated with poverty, gender, and language background among different groups of students.

The Protocol’s Structure:

1. Required Conditions for School Intervention.
2. Allowable School Intervention Models for School Intervention.
 - a. Turnaround model.
 - b. Restart model.
 - c. School closure.
 - d. Transformation model.
3. Internal Accountability for Reform
4. Identification of Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools, Method for Identification of Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools
5. LEA Duties & Responsibilities
6. Role of State Education Agency

The Strategic Plan, the BEP and The Protocol will be the foundation documents that the RIDE will utilize to support LEAs in the process of applying for and effectively utilizing SIG Funds.

B. EVALUATION CRITERIA: An SEA must provide the criteria it will use to evaluate the information set forth below in an LEA's application for a School Improvement Grant.

Part 1

The three actions listed in Part 1 are ones that an LEA must take prior to submitting its application for a School Improvement Grant. Accordingly, the SEA must describe, with specificity, the criteria the SEA will use to evaluate an LEA's application with respect to each of the following actions:

(1) The LEA has analyzed the needs of each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application and has selected an intervention for each school.

The RIDE shall request that an LEA provide evidence and documentation of the process it undertook to analyze the needs of its identified school(s) and select an intervention for each school.

Documentation

A. An LEA shall provide documentation regarding the designation of a single point of contact, identified as per The Protocol as the School Transformation Officer, who is responsible for ensuring that all applicable legal requirements are met during the reform process, including adherence to The Protocol.

B. An LEA shall provide documentation regarding the convening of a local stakeholder group to serve as a focus group and to provide feedback to the LEA on the four School Intervention Models. The stakeholder group shall include:

- a. The commissioner of Elementary and Secondary education, or designee;
- b. The chair of the school committee, or designee;
- c. The president of the local teacher's union, or designee;
- d. An administrator from each of the identified schools, who may be the principal or other individual as chosen by the Superintendent
- e. A teacher from each identified school, selected by the principal and faculty of the school
- f. A parent from each identified school, selected by the principal and school-based parent organization
- g. A student or youth representative from each identified high school
- h. Representative of applicable state and local social service, health and child welfare agencies, chosen by the Superintendent; and
- i. As appropriate, representatives of the state and local workforce development agencies, chosen by the Superintendent.

C. The Superintendent shall consider the feedback from the local stakeholder group and submit to the Commissioner of Elementary and Secondary education a letter of intent that specifies the recommended School Intervention Model that will be implemented in each school identified as a Tier I or Tier II school.

D. The LEA shall complete a Needs Analysis Table (see Appendix D) to provide detailed documentation of the process undertaken to analyze the needs of the identified school and select

a School Intervention Model. This table will include a detailed explanation of which School Intervention Model was selected, which School Intervention Models were not selected, and why. Additionally, by completing the Needs Analysis Table, the LEA is also assessing its capacity to undertake the selected School Reform Model. The Needs Analysis Table will provide detailed information to the RIDE about the LEA's strengths, as well as areas where the LEA may require technical assistance.

Regarding the process undertaken to analyze the needs of the identified school, the LEA will utilize the Needs Analysis Table to document the analysis completed for each of the major areas listed below:

- a. **Content of the Instructional Program**, which may include (but is not limited to): The rigor of the curriculum; Alignment with state standards; Data-based accountability including analysis of student achievement data; School and State-level Assessments; Extended learning opportunities.
- b. **Leadership**, which may include (but is not limited to): School, LEA and community leadership; Instructional leadership; Organizational structure; Oversight for accountability.
- c. **Personnel structure and supports** which may include (but is not limited to): Staff competencies; Professional development; Rigorous evaluations; External resources and supports.
- d. **Infrastructure**, which may include (but is not limited to): School culture and climate; Community partnerships; Student, family and community supports; Resources.

The Needs Analysis Table will reference any major sources of information examined by the LEA during the process of selecting a School Intervention Model, including (but not limited to) programs, documents, reports, and/or community feedback. The Needs Analysis Table will also include a summary of the results of the analysis as it relates to improving student achievement.

The RIDE Review of Documentation

The RIDE will convene a cross-office team of reviewers, including budget and program staff, under the guidance of the Transformation Office to review this documentation. The team will judge the submitted documentation by responding to the following questions:

Process Questions

1. Has sufficient information been provided about the LEA's single point of contact, as per The Protocol?
2. Was the information provided about the stakeholder group and community outreach processes consistent with The Protocol?
3. Was the process of selecting a School Intervention Model adequate?
4. Was the rationale for selecting one School Intervention Model, against the other three options, sufficiently described?

School Context And Need Questions

1. Is the information adequate to describe the school's context and need in each of the four major areas?

Upon receipt the Letter of Intent, the Commissioner shall have 10 days to approve or reject the

selection of the School Intervention Model.

(2) The LEA has demonstrated that it has the capacity to use school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application in order to implement fully and effectively the selected intervention in each of those schools.

The Protocol notes that each responsible LEA must establish the requisite capacity and internal infrastructure to properly manage the chosen School Intervention Model, as it is unlikely that sustainable improvement is achievable unless there are considerable changes to the capacity of the school to move forward. Each LEA must provide information pertaining to its capacity in order to adhere to The Protocol and complete The Needs Assessment Table. The RIDE will utilize this information to judge each LEA's capacity. Specifically, the RIDE will look at the five different areas below (listed as A-E), and judge each based on the criteria therein.

A. THE NEEDS ANALYSIS TABLE: As an indicator of capacity, the LEA shall complete a Needs Analysis Table (see Appendix D) which will document the needs of the identified school(s) and the capacity of the LEA to meet those needs, and use those analyses to select a School Intervention Model. In completing the Needs Analysis Table, the LEA is both assessing and providing evidence of its capacity to undertake the selected School Reform Model. In reviewing the Needs Analysis Table, the RIDE will look for evidence of LEA capacity in four areas:

1. Content of Instructional Program, which may include (but is not limited to):
 - a. The rigor of the curriculum
 - b. Alignment with state standards
 - c. Data-based accountability
 - d. School and State-level Assessments
 - e. Extended learning opportunities
2. Leadership, which may include (but is not limited to):
 - a. School, district and community leadership
 - b. Instructional leadership
 - c. Organizational structure
 - d. Oversight for accountability
3. Personnel structure and supports, which may include (but is not limited to):
 - a. Staff competencies
 - b. Professional development
 - c. Rigorous evaluations
 - d. External resources and supports
4. Infrastructure, which may include (but is not limited to):
 - a. School culture and climate
 - b. Community partnerships
 - c. Student, family and community supports
 - d. Resources

B. AN EFFECTIVE INTERNAL ACCOUNTABILITY FRAMEWORK: As an indicator of capacity, an LEA must demonstrate that it has --or has the ability to implement-- an effective internal accountability framework that:

1. Generates and focuses attention on data-based information relevant to teaching and

learning;

2. Provides opportunities for educators (and others) to attend not only to current information and programs, but to augment or change strategies in response to this information;
3. Develops the knowledge and skills to promote valid interpretation of the information;
4. Allocates resources where they are most needed.

C. A SCHOOL TRANSFORMATION OFFICER: As an indicator of capacity, an LEA must demonstrate that it has --or has the ability to hire-- a School Transformation Officer who will manage its school reform efforts and report directly to the Superintendent or Chief Academic Officer. The School Transformation Officer may have additional staff support depending on the size of the LEA and the number of schools identified for reform. The RIDE will work with each LEA to determine the structure and staffing needs in order to provide sufficient capacity to implement the chosen School Intervention Model(s). At a minimum there must be a single point of contact, identified as the School Transformation Officer, who is responsible for ensuring that all applicable legal requirements are met during the reform process.

The School Transformation Officer is accountable to ensure that the LEA:

1. Takes into account concerns of key stakeholders, especially parents and students;
2. Has the requisite knowledge and analytic capacity to inform ongoing reform efforts and evaluate the efficacy of the implementation of such efforts; and
3. Is capable of producing evidence of well-informed and unflinching decisions that are made in the best interests of students despite outside pressures to accommodate the needs and demands of adults in the public education system.
4. Have expertise with school reform and a demonstrable history supporting and leading district and school initiatives.

D. A COMMUNICATION PLAN: As an indicator of capacity, an LEA must demonstrate that it has --or has the ability to institute-- a comprehensive and ongoing plan for communication with affected students, families, educators, community leaders and organizations. The purpose of such a communication plan shall be to engage affected family and community members in the work of reforming affected schools in order to provide students with meaningful choices to access the most effective learning environments possible. At a minimum, LEA-generated community outreach shall consist of the following components:

1. Ongoing mechanisms for meaningful and periodic family and community engagement in appropriate languages and a variety of delivery mechanisms;
2. Usable and accessible information provided to students and their families about school options if their school has been identified as one of the state's persistently lowest-achieving schools;
3. A communications strategy that fully explains a fair and equitable mechanism for student selection among available school choice options if the student's school is identified for reform under The Protocol (student choice must include a non-charter school option if the affected school is converted to a public charter school); and,
4. A detailed transportation plan that accommodates students who desire to attend a school that is not currently served by the LEA's existing transportation plan.

E. A SCHOOL REFORM PLAN: As an indicator of capacity, an LEA must demonstrate that it has the ability to design and implement a School Reform Plan. For each identified school in an LEA, the Superintendent is responsible for designing a School Reform Plan based on student need and student outcome data. At a minimum, the Plan shall meet the legal requirements for a “school plan” as set forth at 20 U.S.C. 6316(b) (3) in accordance with guidance from the RIDE. It is critical that the Plan be sufficiently detailed in regard to governance, budget, staffing, instructional program, supports to students and staff, and other programmatic elements as needed to fully implement the reform elements set forth herein for the specific reform model chosen for each identified school.

(3) The LEA’s budget includes sufficient funds to implement the selected intervention fully and effectively in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA’s application as well as to support school improvement activities in Tier III schools throughout the period of availability of those funds (taking into account any waiver extending that period received by either the SEA or the LEA).

It is the RIDE’s intent to request a waiver to extend the availability of SIG 1003(g) funds to September 30, 2013.

In its application, the LEA will be asked to submit a budget summary for each year of implementation which summarizes expenditures for compensation for personnel services, employees benefits for personnel services, purchased professional and technical services, purchased property services, other purchased services, materials and supplies, property and equipment, and indirect costs. For the first year of implementation, the LEA must submit budget detail for each category of expenditure noted above. The budget review process will include a careful examination of all budget requests, and whether such requests are reasonable and necessary to effectively implement the selected School Intervention Model. Any budget request for LEA-level activities must include a justification statement that specifically describes how any LEA-level requests support the implementation of the School Intervention Model in the identified, eligible school(s). Additionally, the annual budget will include a matrix that summarizes school-level expenditures in each major budget category. Review of this matrix will allow the RIDE to assure that an LEA’s budget adheres to the minimum/maximum amounts per school in accordance to SIG 1003(g) final regulations.

When the LEA proposes a budget for its selected School Intervention Model, the district must demonstrate that the budget supports and serve the needs of the identified school and its students; budgetary allocations will not be formula-driven.

The RIDE has adopted a Uniform Chart of Accounts (UCOA) which requires LEAs to code each expenditure in budgets. The UCOA allows the RIDE to determine specific school-level versus LEA-level requests. The UCOA makes LEA investments more transparent, enables RIDE to monitor the equitable distribution of fiscal and human resources, and help identify any practices that systematically lead to disparities between high and low poverty schools. By requiring the UCOA coding in the SIG 1003(g) budget, the RIDE will be able to analyze LEA and school-based expenditures, and compare these expenditures against other funding streams to ensure coordination of resources.

Part 2

The actions in Part 2 are ones that an LEA may have taken, in whole or in part, prior to submitting its application for a School Improvement Grant but, most likely, will take after receiving a School Improvement Grant. Accordingly, an SEA must describe how it will assess the LEA's commitment to do the following:

The Protocol provides a timeline of actions to be undertaken by an LEA and the RIDE when one or more of an LEA's schools have been identified as a Tier I or Tier II school. The RIDE will utilize this timeline (modified as necessary to meet all SIG implementation requirements) to track and measure the progress of an LEA as it undertakes the steps necessary to implement one of the School Intervention Models.

TIMELINE:

- Schools identified as persistently lowest-achieving require intervention by the responsible LEA beginning in the school year following identification by the state.
- The Superintendent shall submit to the Commissioner of Elementary and Secondary Education a letter of intent that specifies the recommended School Intervention Model that will be implemented in each school identified as persistently-lowest-achieving. The letter of intent describing the School Intervention Model must be submitted for approval within business 45 days of designation as a persistently lowest-achieving school.

In the alternative, if an LEA is unable or unwilling to implement one of the four School Intervention Models, the LEA shall provide notice of said inability within 45 days of notification that one of its schools has been identified as one of the state persistently lowest-achieving schools.

- Upon receipt of the Superintendent's letter of intent, the Commissioner shall have 10 days to approve or reject the LEA's selection of a School Intervention Model. The determination to approve or reject the LEA selection of a School Intervention Model will include a review of the Needs Analysis Table on which the LEA must document the analysis that was completed for Content of Instructional Program which includes standards, curriculum, assessments and student performance, Leadership, Personnel Structures and Supports.
- Upon the Commissioner's approval of a School Intervention Model, the Superintendent shall have no more than 120 business days in which to draft a comprehensive School Reform Plan.
- Within the 120 period described above, the Superintendent shall submit the comprehensive School Reform Plan, complete with a school-based budget, to the Commissioner for approval. The Commissioner shall have 30 days in which to approve, modify, or reject the Plan.
- Once accepted by the Commissioner, the School Reform Plan shall be implemented over a three year period.

(1) Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements.

The Superintendent shall convene the local stakeholder group in order to solicit input for the development of a comprehensive School Reform Plan (“Plan”) based on the LEA’s choice of School Intervention Model. The purpose of convening this group is to make recommendations to the Superintendent in regard to the content of a reform plan that is specific to each identified school and which incorporates the required elements of the selected School Intervention Model as outlined in The Protocol. The Superintendent shall consider stakeholder input, but the Superintendent is responsible for designing a School Reform Plan based on student need and student outcome data.

At a minimum, the Plan shall meet the legal requirements for a “school plan” as set forth at 20 U.S.C. 6316(b) (3) in accordance with guidance from the RIDE. It is critical that the Plan be sufficiently detailed in regard to governance, budget, staffing, instructional program, supports to students and staff, and other programmatic elements as needed to fully implement the reform elements set forth herein for the specific School Intervention Model chosen for each identified school.

The Superintendent shall have no more than 120 days in which to draft a comprehensive School Reform Plan. There shall be substantial and meaningful opportunity for public comment and input during the 120 day period. The Superintendent will seek out assistance as needed from the Rhode Island Department of Education in the development of the Plan. The Superintendent shall give good faith consideration to all public input proposed modifications and comments and determine the need for modifications to the Plan prior to its submittal to the Commissioner.

(2) Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality.

If an LEA proposes a School Intervention Model that requires an external provider, the LEA must identify and select that provider using a process that adheres to local and state procurement requirements. Additionally, the RIDE requires the LEA to ensure that the external provider is sufficiently vetted, in order to reasonably ensure that the performance of the school under its management will significantly outperform the past performance of the school on measures to be determined by the Commissioner; this decision will incorporate the criteria listed below. The LEA’s process will be closely monitored by the RIDE, who will provide oversight and technical assistance during each step of identifying and selecting an external provider.

In addition to the processes mentioned above, the RIDE will work with the LEA to develop and implement a rubric of unique criteria for vetting and selecting external providers, depending on the LEA’s selected School Intervention Model. These criteria may include, but are not limited to:

- Required and/or permissible actions for intervention(s) and improvement activities;
- Specific qualifications, such as demonstrated success in turning around schools or research-based methods of school reform;
- Specific services that are matched to the needs of the students and to the selected School Intervention Model;
- A cost to the district that is reasonable, and services that are necessary for implementing the School Reform Model with fidelity;
- The consequences that will occur if the provider does not meet its obligations.

(3) Align other resources with the interventions.

The School Reform Plan submitted by each LEA must reflect the coordination of local and federal resources with SIG funds in ways that support the successful implementation of the LEA's chosen School Intervention Model. In identifying the strategies that it will employ to implement the School Intervention Model, an LEA will be asked to identify all other funding sources that could be utilized to support activities in a coordinated manner. The UCOA will allow the RIDE to analyze an LEA's budget and compare proposed expenditures across programs, ensuring coordination and supplemental use of federal funds.

(4) Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable it to implement the interventions fully and effectively.

The Protocol provides guidance on the ways in which an LEA must modify its practices in order to demonstrate its commitment to its selected School Intervention Model. The Protocol's guidance includes the following:

A. The LEA shall institute a comprehensive and ongoing plan for communication with affected students, families, educators, community leaders and organizations. The purpose of such a communication plan shall be to engage affected family and community members in the work of reforming affected schools in order to provide students with meaningful choices to access the most effective learning environments possible.

B. The LEA's school reform strategies must include:

1. Flexible funding at the school level to the extent authorized by applicable law; including: collective bargaining agreements that permit hiring without regard to seniority, or, alternatively, to comply with existing legal requirements regarding assignment of education professionals.
2. Comprehensive instructional reform, including:
 - a. Improved instructional programs and differentiated instruction;
 - b. Modifications to scheduling to increase learning time for students and maximize collaboration time for teachers - consider extended learning time, modified or block scheduling; and,
 - c. Periodic reviews to ensure that the curriculum is being implemented with fidelity, is having the intended impact on student achievement, and is modified if ineffective;
3. Improved teacher and school leader effectiveness, including:
 - a. Development of valid and reliable pathways for bringing talented leadership into the schools affected by LEA reform efforts, as well as ongoing supports to administrators and teacher leaders in such schools once reform under The Protocol is instituted;
 - b. Supports and professional development to teachers and principals in order to implement effective strategies to support students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment and to ensure that limited English proficient students acquire language skills to master academic content;
 - c. Assurances that school-based leaders have access to relevant data regarding school, educator and student performance, as well as the ability to perform and/or access meaningful diagnostic analysis to ensure that available data is used to inform decisions regarding ongoing reform efforts; and,
 - d. Evaluation of all professional staff in accordance with State standards and SIG requirements.

C. The parties to any applicable collective bargaining agreement will use their best good-faith efforts to negotiate any terms and conditions in the agreement necessary for the full implementation of the identified school reform model for an identified persistently lowest-achieving school. The parties shall further understand that the failure to negotiate any term or condition in a collective bargaining agreement necessary to meet the criteria for full implementation of the identified school reform model will result in the termination of applicable grants relevant to implementation of said reform model.

D. In addition, the RIDE recognizes that, in order to modify some practices and policies, an LEA may require the support of members of some or all of the following groups: The School Committee, LEA Leaders, Teachers Unions, and/or Municipal and Community Leaders. Therefore, the RIDE will look for evidence that those bodies are committed to supporting the LEA's efforts, and are agreeable to executing any changes that need to occur in order to implement the intervention fully and effectively. The RIDE also considers this to be an issue of LEA capacity.

(5) Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.

In order to demonstrate that an LEA will sustain the reforms after the funding period ends, the RIDE will examine each LEA's plan for some or all the following indicators:

- A.** Reform efforts that immediately and sustainably increase capacity but do not require the long-term use of funds. This may include intensive professional development efforts; lasting adjustments to school calendars/time; recruitment, placement, and retention of effective staff; the implementation of an instructional program that is research-based and vertically aligned; the establishment of a system of student data use that informs and differentiates instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students; partnerships with other organizations that will improve students' experience in school; and the creation of a rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for teachers and principals. The RIDE will consider these, and other projects that utilize short-term spending with long-term impact, to be sustainable.
- B.** The RIDE will also examine an LEA's three-year budget to examine when and how funds are spent. A sustainable budget may decrease funding each year to minimize the funding cliff at the end of the grant period, or may secure funding from other sources to maintain funding levels once the granting period is over.
- C.** The RIDE will look to each LEA to coordinate local and federal resources with the SIG funds in ways that support the successful maintenance of the LEA's goals and efforts.

C. CAPACITY: The SEA must explain how it will evaluate whether an LEA lacks capacity to implement a School Intervention Model in each Tier I school.

An LEA that applies for a School Improvement Grant must serve each of its Tier I schools using one of the four School Intervention Models unless the LEA demonstrates that it lacks sufficient capacity to do so. If an LEA claims it lacks sufficient capacity to serve each Tier I school, the SEA must evaluate the sufficiency of the LEA's claim. Claims of lack of

capacity should be scrutinized carefully to ensure that an LEA effectively intervenes in as many of its Tier I schools as possible.

The SEA must explain how it will evaluate whether an LEA lacks capacity to implement a School Intervention Model in each Tier I school. The SEA must also explain what it will do if it determines that an LEA has more capacity than the LEA demonstrates.

The RIDE will evaluate whether an LEA lacks capacity to implement a School Intervention Model in each Tier I school by utilizing Needs Analysis Table and The Protocol's indicators of capacity. Specifically, the RIDE will determine that an LEA lacks capacity if one or more of the following indicators is present:

A. Upon completion of the Needs Analysis Table (see Appendix D), the LEA documents the needs of the identified school(s) and determines that it lacks the capacity to meet those needs. In order to satisfactorily complete the Needs Analysis Table, the LEA must assess its capacity and determine whether or not it has the ability to undertake the selected School Reform Model. The RIDE will determine that the LEA lacks capacity if the Needs Analysis Table provides evidence that the LEA does not have the capacity to use school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each identified school, in order to implement fully and effectively the selected intervention in each of those schools, and/or to ask for SEA assistance in building that capacity.

B. An LEA demonstrates that it does not have and cannot implement an effective internal accountability framework that:

1. Generates and focuses attention on data-based information relevant to teaching and learning;
2. Provides opportunities for educators (and others) to attend not only to current information and programs, but to augment or change strategies in response to this information;
3. Develops the knowledge and skills to promote valid interpretation of the information; and,
4. Allocates resources where they are most needed.

C. An LEA does not have the capacity to manage its school reform efforts under the leadership of a school transformation officer who reports directly to the Superintendent or Chief Academic Officer, and who may have additional staff support depending on the size of the LEA and the number of schools identified for reform. An LEA does not have and cannot implement a single point of contact, identified as the LEA School Transformation Officer, who is responsible for ensuring that all applicable legal requirements are met during the reform process.

D. An LEA does not have the capacity to institute a comprehensive and ongoing plan for communication with affected students, families, educators, community leaders and organizations. The purpose of such a communication plan shall be to engage affected family and community members in the work of reforming affected schools in order to provide students with meaningful choices to access the most effective learning environments possible.

E. The Superintendent will not or cannot design a School Reform Plan based on student need and student outcome data, that meets the legal requirements for a “school plan” as set forth at 20 U.S.C. 6316(b)(3) in accordance with guidance from the RIDE.

F. The RIDE will determine that an LEA lacks capacity to implement a School Intervention Model if the parties to any applicable collective bargaining agreement fail to negotiate any term or condition in a collective bargaining agreement necessary to meet the criteria for full implementation of the identified School Reform Plan.

If the RIDE determines that an LEA has more capacity than the LEA demonstrates, the RIDE will consider that LEA to be unable or unwilling to implement the School Reform Plan. Therefore, according to The Protocol: If the LEA is unable or unwilling to implement one of the four School Intervention Models that shall be cause to trigger the reconstitution authorities granted the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education and the Board of Regents pursuant to RIGL § 16-7.1-5. Section 16-7.1-5 reads, in part, as follows: *...the school shall be reconstituted. Reconstitution responsibility is delegated to the board of regents and may range from restructuring the school’s governance, budget, program, personnel, and/or may include decisions regarding the continued operation of the school.*

D. DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION: An SEA must include the information set forth below.

(1) Describe the SEA’s process and timeline for approving LEA applications.

The RIDE has requested and received an extension on the submission date for the SIG grant application to March 1, 2010.

March 1, 2010	Submitted application to US ED
March 1, 2010- June25, 2010	Worked with US ED on review and revision of SIG application.
April- June, 2010	LEA work on School Reform Plan
July, 2010	LEA application submission and review.
August, 2010	LEA awards

The RIDE will convene a cross-office team of reviewers, including budget and program staff, under the guidance of the Transformation Office. Upon reviewing all applications, this group will meet individually with LEAs to ensure that the LEA has the ability to get the basic elements of its selected models up and running by the beginning of the 2010–2011 school year, and to ensure that the LEA application meets the SIG final requirements. After the LEA has met with this team, it may be required to amend its application prior to its approval.

(2) Describe the SEA’s process for reviewing an LEA’s annual goals for student achievement for its Tier I and Tier II schools and how the SEA will determine whether to renew an LEA’s School Improvement Grant with respect to one or more Tier I or

Tier II schools in the LEA that are not meeting those goals and making progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements.

In its SIG application, each LEA will provide a detailed School Reform Plan, including a timeline indicating student achievement goals and when they will be met. The RIDE will monitor the School Reform Plan quarterly for progress towards the stated school improvement goals. The RIDE will also monitor the School Reform Plan annually for progress towards the leading indicators in Section III of the final requirements.

If progress is deemed to be insufficient, the Commissioner may require modifications to the Plan as needed to address unmet goals. If the school has substantially failed to meet multiple goals, the Commissioner may appoint an external operator to manage the implementation of the plan; terminate the contract of an existing operator; or reconstitute the school pursuant to the authorities set forth at RIGL § 16-7.1-5.

(3) Describe the SEA's process for reviewing the goals an LEA establishes for its Tier III schools (subject to approval by the SEA) and how the SEA will determine whether to renew an LEA's School Improvement Grant with respect to one or more Tier III schools in the LEA that are not meeting those goals.

An LEA that proposes to serve a Tier III school must submit a School Reform Plan that outlines activities that will be undertaken to improve areas of need, and identifies measurable goals of student progress. The RIDE will monitor an LEA's School Reform Plan quarterly for progress on student achievement goals, as well as monitoring local formative exams and state examinations to gauge progress. If progress is deemed to be insufficient, the Commissioner may require modifications to the Plan as needed to address unmet goals. If the school has substantially failed to meet multiple goals in the Plan, the Commissioner may decide not to renew the LEA's School Improvement Grant for that Tier III school.

(4) Describe how the SEA will monitor each LEA that receives a School Improvement Grant to ensure that it is implementing a School Intervention Model fully and effectively in the Tier I and Tier II schools the LEA is approved to serve.

The RIDE will monitor each LEA using the guidance laid out in The Protocol. The LEA must demonstrate no-less-than annually that it still has the capacity to use SIG funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school identified, and will be able to implement fully and effectively the selected School Intervention Model in each of those schools. To this end the Commissioner may, in consultation with the Superintendent, modify the School Reform Plan if the Commissioner determines that:

- A.** The Plan, as written, fails to promote the rapid academic achievement of students in the applicable school;
- B.** A component of the Plan was included, or a modification was excluded, on the basis of demonstrably-false information or evidence; or,
- C.** The Plan fails to meet the substantive requirements of The Protocol.
- D.** Each School Reform Plan shall include a timeline for implementation of the components of the selected School Intervention Model. That timeline shall be reviewed each quarter

by the Commissioner or a designee, to determine fidelity. When incidences of non-fidelity are identified, the LEA shall provide reasons for lack of fidelity, and the Commissioner shall determine if those reasons are acceptable and surmountable, or whether they reflect an inability or unwillingness to implement the one of the four School Intervention Models. At this time, the RIDE shall also examine student progress, as measured by local assessments that are aligned to the NECAP exam.

RIDE has recently established an Office of Transformation to lead the work with the PLAs. RIDE will closely monitor each LEA that receives a SIG grant in the following ways:

1) In accordance with recommendations of the Protocol, schools in Tier I and Tier II must construct a School Reform Plans (SRP) articulating the methods through which improved student learning will be ensured. Team members from the Office of Transformation, in conjunction with other relevant offices in RIDE, will coordinate periodic visits to these schools. Visits will be comprised of instructional observation, artifact examination, focus group discussions and checklists for progress monitoring on the objectives outlined in SRPs.

2) Schools in Tier I and Tier II will also be expected to check in "electronically" with RIDE to report on the use of SIG monies through on-line surveys and interactive web-based discussions (To occur quarterly. It may be determined that additional sessions will be added.) As noted, each school reform plan will include a timeline for implementation of the components of the selected School Intervention Model. That timeline shall be reviewed each quarter by the Commissioner or a designee, to determine fidelity.

3) RIDE will sponsor collaborative meetings between the leaders of the schools in Tier I and II for the express purpose of highlighting and sharing student gains, professional learning achievements and total school goals that have been achieved through the use of the SIG funds. (One per semester). Relevant strategies, practices and activities from these sessions will be distilled and shared through a bi-monthly "news-brief" accessible by way of the RIDE website.

(5) Describe how the SEA will prioritize School Improvement Grants to LEAs if the SEA does not have sufficient school improvement funds to serve all eligible schools for which each LEA applies.

The Tier I schools have been identified using Rhode Island's definition of Persistently Lowest Achieving schools, and are listed in rank order based on their overall level of need. An LEA will be granted SIG funds to serve a Tier I school if it submits an approvable application that adequately addresses the needs of the school and demonstrates the capacity to implement its selected School Intervention Model.

Should the RIDE not have sufficient SIG funds to serve all LEAs with schools in Tier I, priority will be given to those Tier I schools that exhibit the greatest need for, and the strongest commitment to, one of the four School Intervention Models. The RIDE will measure a school's need based on its ranking on the list of Persistently Lowest Achieving Schools. The RIDE will measure a school's commitment using an objective measure of that school's willingness and capacity to fully and effectively implement one of the four School Intervention Models. This

measure will gauge LEA commitment based on:

- A review of the LEA's School Reform Plan, for comprehensiveness and strategies that align with the selected School Intervention Model
- The LEA's ability and willingness to follow The Protocol
- The information provided by the LEA's completed Needs Analysis Table
- LEA resources and staffing
- LEA willingness and ability to use data to review and revise its school reform process

The RIDE will use SIG funds to have a significant and high-quality impact on a small number of schools, rather than a small impact on a large quantity of schools.

LEAs will be eligible for SIG funding for Tier II schools after all Tier I schools are served. Tier II schools have been identified using Rhode Island's definition of Persistently Lowest Achieving schools and are listed in rank order based on their overall level of need. Should the RIDE not have sufficient funds to serve all LEAs with schools in Tier II, priority will be given to those LEAs with Tier II schools that exhibit the greatest need for, and the strongest commitment to, one of the four School Intervention Models. Need and commitment will be measured for Tier II schools in the same manner that it is measured for Tier I schools.

(6) Describe the criteria, if any, that the SEA intends to use to prioritize among Tier III schools.

Given the amount of SIG funds allocated to Rhode Island, and the needs of our Tier I and Tier II schools, the RIDE does not anticipate serving any of its Tier III schools. This is in the interest of implementing a small number of high-quality interventions, in order to generate increased achievement in the state's lowest-achieving schools.

However, should the situation arise where the RIDE is able to serve LEAs with Tier III schools, the Tier III schools will be prioritized based on our definition for identifying persistently lowest-achieving schools. The Tier III schools served will be those with the greatest need.

(7) If the SEA intends to take over any Tier I or Tier II schools, identify those schools and indicate the School Intervention Model the SEA will implement in each school.

At this time, the RIDE does not intend to take over any Tier I or Tier II schools. However, if an LEA lacks the capacity or willingness to serve a Tier I school, that shall be cause to trigger the reconstitution authorities granted the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. Should the Board of Regents exercise its authority to reconstitute a school, it becomes the responsibility of the RIDE to determine how the school will then be managed. Unless the Regents specify otherwise in a particular case, reconstitution shall be presumed to take the affected school out of the LEA the school must be considered to be under the direct control of the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. There shall be an Office of School Transformation at the RIDE that will have the responsibility of coordinating all communications and interactions between the reconstituted school and the RIDE.

In the case where an LEA does not have the capacity or the willingness to serve a Tier I school, reconstitution shall mean the implementation of the turnaround, restart, or transformation model.

When issued, the Order of Reconstitution shall outline the ways in which the school will undertake one of the four School Intervention Models. The specific model will vary depending on the factual circumstances specific to each affected school.

(8) If the SEA intends to provide services directly to any schools in the absence of a takeover, identify those schools and, for Tier I or Tier II schools, indicate the School Intervention Model the SEA will implement in each school, and provide evidence of the LEA's approval to have the SEA provide the services directly.¹

At this time, the RIDE does not intend to provide services directly to any schools. However, if the RIDE later decides that it will provide such services, it will amend this application to provide the required information.

E. ASSURANCES: The SEA must provide the assurances set forth below.

By submitting this application, the SEA assures that it will do the following:

- ✓ **Comply with the final requirements and ensure that each LEA carries out its responsibilities.**
- ✓ **Award each approved LEA a School Improvement Grant in an amount that is of sufficient size and scope to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school that the SEA approves the LEA to serve.**
- ✓ **Apportion its school improvement funds in order to make grants to LEAs, as applicable, that are renewable for the length of the period of availability, taking into account any waivers that may have been requested and received by the SEA or an individual LEA to extend the period of availability.**
- ✓ **Carry over 25 percent of its FY 2009 school improvement funds, combine those funds with FY 2010 school improvement funds, and award those funds to eligible LEAs consistent with the final requirements if not every Tier I school in the State receives FY 2009 school improvement funds to implement a school improvement model in the 2010-2011 school year (unless the SEA does not have sufficient school improvement funds to serve every Tier I school in the State).**
- ✓ **Ensure, if the SEA is participating in the Department's differentiated accountability pilot, that its LEAs will use school improvement funds consistent with the final requirements.**
- ✓ **Monitor each LEA's implementation of the interventions supported with school**

¹ If, at the time an SEA submits its application, it has not yet determined whether it will provide services directly to any schools in the absence of a takeover, it may omit this information from its application. However, if the SEA later decides that it will provide such services, it must amend its application to provide the required information.

improvement funds.

- ✓ **To the extent a Tier I or Tier II school implementing the restart model becomes a charter school LEA, hold the charter school operator or charter management organization accountable, or ensure that the charter school authorizer holds the respective entity accountable, for meeting the final requirements.**
- ✓ **Post on its Web site, within 30 days of awarding School Improvement Grants, all final LEA applications and a summary of the grants that includes the following information: name and NCES identification number of each LEA awarded a grant; amount of the grant; name and NCES identification number of each school to be served; and type of intervention to be implemented in each Tier I and Tier II school.**
- ✓ **Report the specific school-level data required in section III of the final requirements.**

F. SEA RESERVATION: An SEA may reserve an amount not to exceed five percent of its School Improvement Grant for administration, evaluation, and technical assistance expenses.

The SEA must briefly describe the activities related to administration, evaluation, and technical assistance that the SEA plans to conduct with the State-level funds it has received from its School Improvement Grant.

The RIDE Office of Transformation will have primary responsibility for the administration of all programs for LEAs with persistently low-achieving schools. The Transformation Office will coordinate the work of staff from other offices within the RIDE to support the implementation of school reform initiatives, and will lead the collection and review of performance metrics and progress towards milestones and goals.

As needed, the RIDE will contract with outside consultants and organizations with content area expertise and a national track-record of success to design and deliver technical assistance to LEAs with persistently low-achieving schools.

On a quarterly basis, the RIDE staff will evaluate an LEA's fidelity to project implementation and student progress based on the timeline of activities submitted as part of an LEA's application. Results of this quarterly review will guide the provision of technical assistance and support to LEAs, either through existing the RIDE capacity or contracts with outside consultants.

Additionally, the RIDE proposes to hire an outside evaluator to assess the state level and district level processes, policies, and activities related to school reform.

G. CONSULTATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS: An SEA must consult with its Committee of Practitioners and is encouraged to consult with other stakeholders regarding its application for a School Improvement Grant.

Before submitting its application for a School Improvement Grant to the Department, the SEA must consult with its Committee of Practitioners established under section 1903(b) of the ESEA regarding the rules and policies contained therein.

- ✓ **The SEA has consulted with its Committee of Practitioners regarding the information set forth in its application. A meeting was held on February 3rd, 2010**
- ✓ **The SEA has consulted with other relevant stakeholders:** Rhode Island's Commissioner of Education, Deborah A. Gist has taken bold and progressive steps to promote, discuss, and solicit feedback on several education reform initiatives which are aligned with the intents and purposes of SIG. Specifically, *The Strategic Plan For Transforming Education in Rhode Island* and *Rhode Island's Race to the Top Application* (RTTT) were created with significant input from all relevant stakeholder groups (parents, teachers, students, community leaders), and the Commissioner held five community forums to solicit additional feedback and input. Additionally, the Commissioner visited every LEA to present the strategic plan to obtain further input on the priorities and initiatives needed to transform education in Rhode Island. The Commissioner has also consulted with numerous stakeholders about the implementation and repercussions associated with *The Protocol for Interventions: Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools*; these conversations will continue to deepen and unfold throughout the SIG application process.

While not all of the meetings and conversations listed above were about SIG directly, they display the RIDE's commitment to deliberate and extensive stakeholder consultation. Moreover, as the RIDE moves forward with its plan for educational transformation in Rhode Island, it will continue to align all initiatives in a thoughtful and deliberate manner.

H. WAIVERS: The final requirements invite an SEA to request waivers of the requirements set forth below.

Rhode Island requests a waiver of the requirements it has listed below. These waivers would allow any local educational agency (LEA) in the State that receives a School Improvement Grant to use those funds in accordance with the final requirements for School Improvement Grants and the LEA's application for a grant.

The State believes that the requested waiver(s) will increase the quality of instruction for students and improve the academic achievement of students in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools by enabling an LEA to use more effectively the school improvement funds to implement one of the four School Intervention Models in its Tier I or Tier II schools and to carry out school improvement activities in its Tier III schools. The four School Intervention Models are specifically designed to raise substantially the achievement of students in the State's Tier I and Tier II schools.

- ✓ Waive section 421(b) of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. § 1225(b)) to

extend the period of availability of school improvement funds for the SEA and all of its LEAs to September 30, 2013.

- ✓ Waive section 1116(b) (12) of the ESEA to permit LEAs to allow their Tier I and Tier II Title I participating schools that will implement a turnaround or restart model to “start over” in the school improvement timeline.
- ✓ Waive the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold in section 1114(a)(1) of the ESEA to permit LEAs to implement a school-wide program in a Tier I or Tier II Title I participating school that does not meet the poverty threshold.

The State assures that it will ensure that any LEA that chooses to implement one or more of these waivers will comply with section II.A.8 of the final requirements. The State assures that it will permit an LEA to implement the waiver(s) only if the LEA receives a School Improvement Grant and requests to implement the waiver(s) in its application. As such, the LEA may only implement the waiver(s) in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, as applicable, included in its application.

The State assures that, prior to submitting this request in its School Improvement Grant application, the State provided all LEAs in the State that are eligible to receive a School Improvement Grant with notice and a reasonable opportunity to comment on this request and has attached a copy of that notice as well as copies of any comments it received from LEAs. The State also assures that it provided notice and information regarding this waiver request to the public in the manner in which the State customarily provides such notice and information to the public and has attached a copy of those notices (See Appendix E).

The State assures that, if it is granted one or more of the waivers requested above, it will submit to the U.S. Department of Education a report that sets forth the name and NCES District Identification Number for each LEA implementing a waiver, including which specific waivers each LEA is implementing.

APPENDIX A: The RIDE's approved definition of "Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools:

RHODE ISLAND'S DEFINITION OF PERSISTENTLY LOWEST-ACHIEVING SCHOOLS AND METHOD FOR IDENTIFYING SCHOOLS

Rhode Island's definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools" is as follows:

Based on the definition, Rhode Island adhered to the federal guidance to analyze its data comprehensively to identify schools in the state.

Using a combination of four elements described in the next section, Rhode Island was able to identify its lowest-performing schools based on a combination of school-wide performance in reading and mathematics, NCLB classification, student growth or graduation rates, and school-wide improvement. Rhode Island identified a subset of Title I schools in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring to identify Tier I; and a subset of Title I secondary schools that are eligible for but do not receive Title I funds for Tier II. Rhode Island is also using the waiver authority granted to it by the US Department of Education to include Title I-served secondary schools in its pool for identification of Tier II schools. Rhode Island defines secondary schools as any middle or high school. In applying the federal definition for persistently lowest-achieving schools, Rhode Island did not have any high schools with a graduation rate that was less than 60% over the past two years.

For both Tiers I and II, 5% of the number of schools was less than five, and Rhode Island therefore identified five schools. However, two elementary schools ranked as five and six had the exact number of points. Therefore, we have six schools identified in Tier I.

Element 1: *School-wide Performance in Reading and Mathematics*

Element 1 is based on school-wide student performance, (all students) in mathematics and reading for the 2008-09 school year. Element 1 identifies those schools with reading and math proficiency rates significantly below respective state-wide average performance. This element uses one and two standard deviation units below the state average to determine each school's score points as follows:

8 points were assigned when overall school performance was more than two standard deviations below the state average. Schools more than two standard deviations below in math had between 0% and 6.6% proficient students and in reading between 0% and 34.4% proficient.

4 points were assigned when overall school performance was between one and two standard deviations below the state average. These schools' proficiency rates in math ranged between 6.6% and 29.5% and in reading between 34.4% and 51.2% proficient.

0 points were assigned when overall school performance was less than one standard deviation below the state average.

APPENDIX A: The RIDE's approved definition of "Persistently Lowest- Achieving Schools:

Element 2: *NCLB Classification*

Element 2 identifies schools based on 2008-09 AYP classifications. Schools were assigned score points as follows:

2 points were assigned to schools under restructuring

1 point was assigned when schools failed to meet AYP for two or more consecutive years

0 points were assigned when schools either met AYP or failed to meet AYP for less than two consecutive years

Element 3: *Student Growth or Graduation*

Element 3 is based on a *Student Growth Percentile* to measure individual student progress for elementary and middle schools. For high schools, graduation rates were used in lieu of student growth percentiles because growth measures were not possible.² Student growth and graduation rates are based on data from the 2007-08 and 2008-09 school years for all students. This element identifies those schools whose median percentile growth is typical or lower than the state average. Elementary and middle schools were assigned the following score points in reading and math:

2 points were assigned when median growth was below the 40th percentile.

1 point was assigned when median growth was between the 40th and 60th percentiles.

0 points were assigned when median growth was above the 60th percentile or when the school proficiency rates for math or reading were above state averages of 52% and 68% respectively.

Rhode Island was able to use its two most recent years of graduation results to contribute to this element. This is because it moved to the NGA cohort formula and was able to calculate this rate for the first time with the graduating class of 2007. Rhode Island has no Title I eligible high school with a graduation rate below 60%. High schools were assigned the following score points based on 2007-08 graduation rates:

2 points were assigned when the school's graduation rate was more than one standard deviation below the overall state average of 73.9%. Schools more than one standard deviation below the state average had graduation rates that ranged from 0% to 57.4%

1 point was assigned when the school's graduation rate was between the overall state average and one standard deviation.

0 points were assigned when the school's graduation rate was higher than the overall state average or when the school proficiency rates for math or reading were above state averages of 52% and 68% respectively.

² This is because only one year of grade 11 data are available, which prevents researchers from obtaining the necessary consecutive-year data to determine student growth percentiles.

APPENDIX A: The RIDE's approved definition of "Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools:

Element 4: *School-wide Improvement in Reading and Mathematics*

Element 4 is based on differences in school-wide student performance for all students in mathematics and reading between the 2005-06³ and the 2008-09 school years. Element 4 identifies those schools with improvement in reading and math proficiency rates significantly below respective state-wide average improvement. This element uses one and two standard deviation units below the state average improvement⁴ (Math = 6.6, Reading = 8.6) to determine each school's score points as follows:

2 points were assigned when the difference in school performance from 2005-06 to 2008-09 was more than two standard deviations below the state average. Schools more than two standard deviations below in math had a decrease in performance greater than 8.7 percentage points and in reading had a decrease in performance greater than 8.1.

1 point was assigned when the difference in school performance from 2005-06 to 2008-09 was between one and two standard deviations below the state average. These schools' decrease in performance in math ranged between 1.1 and 8.7 percentage points and in reading between 0 and 8.1 percentage points.

0 points were assigned when the difference in school performance from 2005-06 to 2008-09 was less than one standard deviation below the state average or when the school proficiency rates for math or reading were above state averages of 52% and 68% respectively.

³ Test results for high schools were not available for the 2005-06 school year. For high schools, therefore, results from 2007-08 were used in lieu of the 2005-06 results.

⁴ State average improvement was determined by calculating the difference between 2005-06 and 2008-09 school-wide percent proficient in math and reading.

APPENDIX B: Rhode Island's List of Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools									
LEVEL	DISTRICT	DISTRICT NCES ID#	SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL NCES ID#	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE
HIGH	Central Falls	4400120	Central Falls Senior High School	440012000026	X				
ELEM	Providence	4400900	Charlotte Woods Elementary School	440090000156	X				
*HIGH	Providence	4400900	Feinstein High School	440090000056	X				
ELEM	Providence	4400900	Lillian Feinstein Elementary, Sackett Street	440090000243	X				
MID	Providence	4400900	Roger Williams Middle School	440090000242	X				
HIGH	Providence	4400900	William B. Cooley/Health & Science Tech. Academy	440090000209	X				
HIGH	Chariho	4400150	The R.Y.S.E. School	440015000286		X			
HIGH	Providence	4400900	Central High School	440090000217		X			
HIGH	Providence	4400900	Mount Pleasant High School	440090000232		X			
HIGH	Providence	4400900	Providence Academy of International Studies	440090000205		X			
HIGH	R.I. School for the Deaf	4400001	Rhode Island School for the Deaf	440000100380		X			
ELEM	Central Falls	4400120	Ella Risk School	440012000027			X		
ELEM	Central Falls	4400120	Veterans Memorial Elementary	440012000385			X		
ELEM	Cumberland	4400270	Ashton School	440027000070			X		
ELEM	Cumberland	4400270	B.F. Norton Elementary School	440027000039			X		
HIGH	MET Career & Tech	4400003	Metropolitan Regional Career & Technical Center	440000300121			X		
ELEM	Pawtucket	4400840	Elizabeth Baldwin School	440084000191			X		
ELEM	Pawtucket	4400840	Fallon Memorial School	440084000192			X		
MID	Pawtucket	4400840	Joseph Jenks Junior High School	440084000197			X		
ELEM	Pawtucket	4400840	M. Virginia Cunningham School	440084000190			X		
HIGH	Pawtucket	4400840	Shea Senior High School	440084000201			X		
HIGH	Pawtucket	4400840	William E Tolman Senior High School	440084000202			X		
HIGH	Providence	4400900	Alvarez High School (formerly Adelaide)	440090000344			X		
ELEM	Providence	4400900	Asa Messer Elementary School	440090000213			X		
ELEM	Providence	4400900	Carl G. Lauro Elementary School	440090000227			X		
HIGH	Providence	4400900	E-Cubed Academy	440090000323			X		
ELEM	Providence	4400900	Edmund W. Flynn Elementary School	440090000219			X		
ELEM	Providence	4400900	George J. West Elementary School	440090000222			X		
MID	Providence	4400900	Gilbert Stuart Middle School	440090000223			X		

APPENDIX B: Rhode Island's List of Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools									
ELEM	Providence	4400900	Harry Kizirian Elementary School	440090000216			X		
HIGH	Providence	4400900	Hope Arts School	440090000322			X		
HIGH	Providence	4400900	Hope Information Technology School	440090000314			X		
ELEM	Providence	4400900	Mary E. Fogarty Elementary School	440090000231			X		
MID	Providence	4400900	Oliver Hazard Perry Middle School	440090000235			X		
ELEM	Providence	4400900	Pleasant View School	440090000236			X		
ELEM	Providence	4400900	Robert L Bailey IV, Elementary School	440090000071			X		
MID	Providence	4400900	Samuel W. Bridgham Middle School	440090000244			X		
ELEM	Providence	4400900	Sergeant Cornel Young, Jr. Elementary School	440090000158			X		
HIGH	Providence	4400900	Textron Chamber of Commerce Academy	440090000055			X		
ELEM	Providence	4400900	Veazie Street School	440090000013			X		
ELEM	Providence	4400900	William D'Abate Elementary School	440090000248			X		
ELEM	Woonsocket	4401200	Bernon Heights School	440120000327			X		
ELEM	Woonsocket	4401200	Citizens Memorial School	440120000329			X		
*The Superintendent and School Board have decided to close Feinstein High School due to facility issues and declining enrollment.									

APPENDIX C: Protocol for Interventions for Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools

Protocol for Interventions: Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools

Commissioner Deborah A. Gist
January 2010 (Amended April 2010)

I. Overview

The Board of Regents for Elementary and Secondary Education has long been committed to closing inequitable gaps in performance and achievement, especially those gaps correlated with poverty, gender, and language background among different groups of students. This commitment was articulated in the Comprehensive Education Strategy (CES) and codified at RIGL Ch. 16-7.1. Chapter 16-7.1 also codified the state's system for School Accountability for Learning and Teaching (SALT), rigorous testing standards, and fiscal and program oversight by the State Education Agency (SEA). In addition, Section 16-7.1-5 created the system of Progressive Support and Intervention (PSI), which authorizes "progressive levels of control by the department of elementary and secondary education over the school and/or district budget, program, and/or personnel" in those schools and districts where SALT and assessment results have demonstrated limited or non-existent increases in rates of student success.

The recently promulgated Basic Education Program regulations incorporate state standards for grade level and grade span proficiency, regulatory requirements for proficiency-based graduation, the Rhode Island Professional Teaching Standards, the Rhode Island Leadership Standards, and the process for continuous improvement and Progressive Support and Intervention, as well as regulations governing delivery of literacy support services, instruction for students with disabilities, and services for English language learners.

The Basic Education Program places a heavy responsibility upon the local education agency (LEA) to hold its schools accountable for continuous improvement of instructional and support systems that advance equity and access to opportunities for students' high achievement. Despite years of well-intentioned effort, however, there remain schools that continue to have unacceptably low levels of student achievement.

When implementation of a strong school improvement plan has failed to such a degree that a school is considered to be one of the persistently lowest-achieving schools in the state, it is incumbent on the LEA to take even stronger action. Based upon established principles of practice and an emerging body of research on the effectiveness of certain educational strategies, the LEA must take action that leads to increased choices, opportunities and outcomes for students. In order to be successful in generating sustainable improvement, LEA action must: set clear expectations for measures of performance; enhance school-level capacity to accelerate improvement; and engage families and the community in an honest dialogue about the urgency for change. Under no circumstances will persistently lowest-achieving schools be allowed to continue to operate under status quo conditions.

II. Definitions

Charter Management Organization (CMO) – A CMO is a non-profit organization that operates or manages charter schools by centralizing or sharing certain functions and resources among schools.

Education Management Organization (EMO) – An EMO is a for-profit or non-profit organization that provides whole-school operation services to an LEA. Examples of an EMO may include, but are not limited to, the following, if they meet the foregoing definition: (a) a

APPENDIX C: Protocol for Interventions for Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools

regional collaborative organized pursuant to RIGL Chapter 16-3.1; and (b) the creation of a joint Management/Labor Compact detailing reciprocal obligations that create a new management structure with shared decision-making designed to fully address the needs of each student in the schools and which fully complies with all applicable requirements set forth in this Protocol.

Expanded Learning Time – The use of a longer school day, week, or year schedule to significantly increase the total number of school hours to include additional time for (a) instruction in core academic subjects as defined in the Basic Education Program; (b) instruction in other subjects and enrichment activities that contribute to a well-rounded education, including for example, physical education, service learning, and experiential and work-based learning opportunities that are provided by partnering, as appropriate, with other organizations; and (c) educators to collaborate, plan, and engage in professional development within and across grades and subjects.

Local Education Agency – A public board of education or other public authority legally constituted within a State for either administrative control or direction of, or to perform a service function for, public elementary or secondary schools in a city, county, township, school district, or other political subdivision of a State, or for a combination of school districts or counties that is recognized in a State as an administrative agency for its public elementary schools or secondary schools.

Persistently lowest-achieving school – (i) Any Title I school in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that (a) is among the lowest-achieving five percent of Title I schools in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring or the lowest-achieving five Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring in the State, whichever number of schools is greater; or (b) Is a high school that has had a graduation rate that is less than 60 percent over the preceding three years; and (ii) Any secondary school that is eligible for Title I funds that (a) Is among the lowest-achieving five percent of secondary schools or the lowest-achieving five secondary schools in the State that are eligible for Title I funds, whichever number of schools is greater; or (b) Is a high school that has had a graduation rate that is less than 60 percent over the preceding three years.

Progressive Support and Intervention – A series of strategies consistent with the Comprehensive Education Strategy and the principles of the "School Accountability for Learning and Teaching" (SALT) for those schools and school districts that continue to fall short of performance goals as determined by objective criteria developed by the Board of Regents, culminating in progressive levels of control by the department of elementary and secondary education over the school and/or district budget, program, and/or personnel if three years of supports by the state have been insufficient for the school and/or district to meet prescribed performance goals.

Reconstitution – Reconstitution responsibility is statutorily delegated to the Board of Regents at RIGL § 16-7.1-5 and may range from restructuring the school's governance, budget, program, personnel, and/or may include decisions regarding the continued operation of the school.

Regional Collaborative – A legal entity created by two or more school committees, in accordance with RIGL Ch. 16-3.1, to conduct jointly instructional education programs and/or administrative functions, provided that the agreement has been reviewed and is recommended by the Commissioner of Elementary and Secondary Education and has the approval of each participating school committee.

APPENDIX C: Protocol for Interventions for Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools

III. Identification of Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools Method for Identification of Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools

The Rhode Island Department of Elementary and Secondary Education's method for identifying persistently lowest-achieving schools as defined in this Protocol includes analysis of the following factors:⁵

- (1) School-wide student performance in mathematics and reading against the state-wide average performance in these subject areas;
- (2) No Child Left Behind Classification with respect to number of years in need of improvement;
- (3) Student growth percentile at elementary and middle school levels in reading and mathematics and graduation rates at high school levels against the state-wide average growth; and,
- (4) School-wide improvement in reading and mathematics between 2005-2006 and the 2008-2009 school years against the state-wide average improvement.

In addition, the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) further authorizes the LEA to perform an annual review of the progress of each of its Title I schools to determine whether the school is making adequate yearly progress (AYP). The LEA may then identify additional schools for school improvement or in need of corrective action or restructuring.⁶ Should an LEA choose to identify additional Title I schools as in need of improvement, corrective action or restructuring, it must publicize and disseminate the results of its local annual review to parents, teachers, principals, schools, and the community so that the instructional staff and leadership can continually refine and improve the program of instruction for all affected students. In the event that an LEA takes advantage of its authority to identify one or more additional Title I schools pursuant to this section, if said identification results in the school being identified by RIDE as one of the State's persistently lowest-achieving schools, the LEA must then implement one of the four allowable school reform models set forth in Section IV.2. of this Protocol at that school within the timelines established herein.

IV. School Intervention

1. Required Conditions. Schools identified as persistently lowest-achieving require intervention by the responsible LEA beginning in the school year following identification by the state. There are four allowable school intervention models: turnaround model, restart model, school closure, or transformation model. If a school identified as a persistently lowest-achieving school has implemented, in whole or in part within the last two years, an intervention that meets the requirements of the turnaround, restart, or transformation models, the school may continue or complete the intervention being implemented.

The parties to any applicable collective bargaining agreement will use their best good-faith efforts to negotiate any terms and conditions in the agreement necessary for the full implementation of the identified school reform model for an identified persistently lowest-achieving school. The parties shall further understand that the failure to negotiate any term or condition in a collective bargaining agreement necessary to meet the criteria for full implementation of the identified school reform model will result in the termination of applicable grants relevant to implementation of said reform model.

⁵ A complete description of the methodology used by RIDE to apply these four criteria to Rhode Island schools is included in RIDE's Title 1 § 1003g application as Appendix A.

⁶ 20 USC § 6316(a) (1) (B).

APPENDIX C: Protocol for Interventions for Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools

2. Allowable School Reform Models. Each School Reform Plan must be built around one of the following four models for intervention.⁷ Regardless of which model is chosen (with the exception of closure), the School Reform Plan must meet the required conditions set forth in Section V of this Protocol in addition to the individual requirements for the specific school intervention model.

(i) Turnaround model.

1. A turnaround model is one in which an LEA must--

- (i) Replace the principal and grant the new principal sufficient operational flexibility (including in staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting) to implement fully a comprehensive approach in order to substantially improve student achievement outcomes and increase high school graduation rates;
- (ii) Use locally adopted competencies to measure the effectiveness of staff who can work within the turnaround environment to meet the needs of students:
 - (A) Screen all existing staff and rehire no more than 50 percent; and,
 - (B) Recruit and select new staff;
- (iii) Implement strategies such as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place, and retain highly qualified staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students;
- (iv) Provide staff with ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program and designed with school staff to ensure that they are able to facilitate effective teaching and learning and successfully implement school reform strategies;
- (v) Adopt a new governance structure, which may include, but is not limited to:
 - (A) Requiring the school to report to a new "turnaround office" in the LEA or SEA;
 - (B) Hire a "turnaround leader," who may also fill the role of the school transformation officer as detailed in section VI.2. of this Protocol, who reports directly to the Superintendent or Chief Academic Officer; or,
 - (C) Enter into a multi-year contract with the LEA or SEA to obtain added flexibility in exchange for greater accountability;
- (vi) Use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based, "vertically aligned" from one grade to the next and aligned with State academic standards;
- (vii) Promote the continuous use of student data (such as from formative, interim, and summative assessments) to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students;
- (viii) Establish schedules and implement strategies that provide expanded learning time (as defined in this Protocol); and
- (ix) Provide appropriate social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports for students.

⁷ The four school reform models set forth herein are adapted directly from the following documents published by the U.S. Department of Education: GUIDANCE ON SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS UNDER SECTION 1003(g) OF THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965, January 21, 2010; and OVERVIEW INFORMATION: RACE TO THE TOP FUND: NOTICE INVITING APPLICATIONS FOR NEW AWARDS FOR FISCAL YEAR (FY) 2010 (Fed. Register, 11/18/09).

APPENDIX C: Protocol for Interventions for Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools

2. A turnaround model may also implement: (a) any of the required and permissible activities under the transformation model; or (b) a new school model (*e.g.*, themed, dual language academy).

(ii) **Restart model.**

1. A restart model is one in which an LEA converts a school or closes and reopens a school under one of the following mechanisms: (1) a charter school operator, or a charter management organization (CMO),⁸ or (2) an education management organization (EMO)⁹ that has been selected through a rigorous review process. A restart model must enroll, within the grades it serves, any former student who wishes to attend the school.

2. Approval of a restart model requires the Commissioner to agree that the entity chosen by the LEA, through a process that adheres to local and state procurement requirements, is sufficiently vetted to reasonably ensure that the performance of the school under its management will significantly outperform the past performance of the school on measures to be determined by the Commissioner.

(iii) **School closure.**

1. School closure occurs when an LEA closes a school and enrolls the students who attended that school in other public schools within the state that are higher achieving. These other schools should be within reasonable proximity to the closed school and may include, but are not limited to, charter schools or new schools for which achievement data are not yet available.

2. Pursuant to RIGL § 16-2-15, closure or relocation of any school is a decision to be made by the school committee, which shall not make such a decision without “good cause.” School closure is further governed by Section 1.14 of the Board of Regents School Construction Regulations, which requires timely notification to RIDE of the LEA’s intention to close a school, coupled with a detailed plan for accommodating impacted students with the LEA’s remaining school buildings. Most importantly, school closure is only an option in those circumstances in which every student in the affected school is able to access a higher performing school than the school to be closed. The Commissioner of Elementary and Secondary Education shall determine the feasibility of such options.

(iv) **Transformation model.**

1. A transformation model is one which the LEA must implement each of the following strategies:

(i) **Teacher and school leader effectiveness.**

The LEA must:

- (A) Replace the principal who led the school prior to commencement of the transformation model;
- (B) Use rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for teachers and principals that --

⁸ Conversion of a public school under the control of a school committee to a public charter school is governed by the parameters set forth at RIGL Chapter 16-77.

⁹ Delegation of control to an EMO over a single school within a school district falls under the school committee's statutory authority to enter into contracts for the care, control care, control, and management of school facilities and equipment. (RIGL §16-2-9(a) (8), (a) (18)).

APPENDIX C: Protocol for Interventions for Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools

- (a) Take into account multiple and diverse data sources, such as student growth (as defined in this notice), observation-based assessments of performance and ongoing collections of professional practice reflective of student achievement, drop-out, attendance and discipline data and increased high-school graduations rates;
- (b) Are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement;
- (c) Identify and reward school leaders, teachers, and other staff who, in implementing this model, have increased student achievement and high-school graduation rates and identify and remove those who, after ample opportunities have been provided for them to improve their professional practice, have not done so;
- (d) Provide staff with ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development (e.g., subject-specific pedagogy, instruction that reflects a deeper understanding of the community served by the school, or differentiated instruction) that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program and designed with school staff to ensure effective teaching and successful implementation of school reform strategies;
- (e) Implement strategies such as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students; and,
- (f) Require that teacher and principal mutually consent to staff assignment, regardless of teacher seniority.

(ii) Comprehensive instructional reform strategies.

The LEA must:

- (A) Use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based, “vertically aligned” from one grade to the next and aligned with State academic standards;
- (B) Promote the continuous use of student data (such as from formative, interim, and summative assessments) to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students; and,
- (C) For secondary schools, establish early-warning systems to identify students who may be at risk of failing to achieve to high standards or graduate.

(iii) Increased learning time and community-oriented schools.

The LEA must:

- (A) Establish schedules and implement strategies that provide expanded learning time (as defined in this Protocol); and,
- (B) Provide ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement.

(iv) Operational flexibility and sustained support.

The LEA must:

- (A) Give the school sufficient operational flexibility (such as staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting) to implement fully a comprehensive approach to substantially improve student achievement outcomes and increase high school graduation rates; and
- (B) Ensure that the school receives ongoing, intensive technical assistance and related support from the LEA, the SEA, or a designated external lead partner organization (such as a school turnaround organization or an EMO).

APPENDIX C: Protocol for Interventions for Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools

V. Internal Accountability for Reform

1. The sole purpose in pursuing any of the four allowable reform models is to provide the students currently attending the school with a better alternative – one that guarantees heightened opportunities for learning and achievement. It is the responsibility of the LEA to focus its efforts on schools as units of intervention and individuals as units of change. Regardless of the reform model selected for an identified school, the LEA must have an effective internal accountability framework that:

- (i) Generates and focuses attention on data-based information relevant to teaching and learning;
- (ii) Provides opportunities for educators (and others) to attend not only to current information and programs, but to augment or change strategies in response to this information;
- (iii) Develops the knowledge and skills to promote valid interpretation of the information; and,
- (iv) Allocates resources where they are most needed.

2. In addition, for each of the four reform models, the LEA's school reform strategies must include:

- (i) Flexible funding at the school level to the extent authorized by applicable law; including: collective bargaining agreements that permit hiring without regard to seniority, or, alternatively, to comply with existing legal requirements regarding assignment of education professionals.
- (ii) Comprehensive instructional reform, including:
 - (A) Improved instructional programs and differentiated instruction;
 - (B) Modifications to scheduling to increase learning time for students and maximize collaboration time for teachers - consider extended learning time, modified or block scheduling; and,
 - (C) Periodic reviews to ensure that the curriculum is being implemented with fidelity, is having the intended impact on student achievement, and is modified if ineffective;
- (iii) Improved teacher and school leader effectiveness, including:
 - (A) Development of valid and reliable pathways for bringing talented leadership into the schools affected by LEA reform efforts, as well as ongoing supports to administrators and teacher leaders in such schools once reform under this Protocol is instituted;
 - (B) Supports and professional development to teachers and principals in order to implement effective strategies to support students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment and to ensure that limited English proficient students acquire language skills to master academic content;
 - (C) Assurances that school-based leaders have access to relevant data regarding school, educator and student performance, as well as the ability to perform and/or access meaningful diagnostic analysis to ensure that available data is used to inform decisions regarding ongoing reform efforts; and,
 - (D) Evaluation of all professional staff in accordance with State standards.

3. In addition to the required activities listed above, an LEA subject to this Protocol is encouraged to:

- (i) Expand performance and instructional management, which may include:
 - (A) Providing performance incentives for teachers and principals based in significant part on school-wide student achievement;
 - (B) Providing additional compensation to attract and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in a transformation school; and
 - (C) Instituting a system for measuring changes in instructional practices resulting from professional development;

APPENDIX C: Protocol for Interventions for Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools

- (ii) Extend, expand or restructure the school day, which may include:
 - (A) Decreasing class size;
 - (B) Developing extended advisory periods that build relationships between students, faculty, and other school staff;
 - (C) Improving student transition from middle to high school through summer transition programs or freshman academies;
- (iii) Increase and expand opportunities for students, which may include:
 - (A) Expanding the school program to offer full-day kindergarten or pre-kindergarten;
 - (B) Offering opportunities and appropriate supports for all students to enroll in varied advanced coursework (such as Advanced Placement or International Baccalaureate; or science, technology, engineering, and mathematics courses, early-college high schools, dual enrollment programs, or thematic learning academies that prepare students for college and careers;
 - (C) Increasing graduation rates through, for example, credit-recovery programs, re-engagement strategies, smaller learning communities, competency-based instruction, and acceleration of basic reading and mathematics skills; and,
 - (D) Integrating technology-based supports and interventions as part of the instructional program;
- (iv) Expand community partnerships which may include partnering with parents and parent organizations, faith- and community-based organizations, health clinics, other State or local agencies, and others to create safe school environments that meet students' social, emotional, and health needs.

VI. LEA Duties & Responsibilities

1. Overview

The fact that a school has been identified as one of the state's persistently lowest-achieving schools means that a significant restructuring of the school's governance structure is required in order to make the fundamental reforms, such as substantial changes in the school's staffing and governance and longer school days, necessary to improve student academic achievement in the school. Further, the responsible LEA must establish the requisite capacity and internal infrastructure to properly manage the reform effort chosen by the LEA in accordance with this Protocol.

In addition, it is unlikely that sustainable improvement is achievable, even with a change to the governance and/or leadership at the affected school, unless the LEA significantly increases the capacity of the school to move forward and creates conditions within the school that are favorable to reform.

2. LEA Management of Transformation

The LEA must manage its school reform efforts under the leadership of a school transformation officer who reports directly to the Superintendent or Chief Academic Officer, and who may have additional staff support depending on the size of the LEA and the number of schools identified for reform. RIDE will work with each LEA to determine the structure and staffing needed in order to provide sufficient capacity to implement the chosen school reform model(s). At a minimum, there must be a single point of contact, identified as the LEA School Transformation Officer, who is responsible for ensuring that all applicable legal requirements are met during the reform process, including adherence to this Protocol. For an LEA that has multiple schools identified as among the state's persistently lowest-achieving Schools, RIDE will determine the number of staff required to fulfill the responsibilities outlined in this Section. Specific duties of individuals responsible for managing school transformation shall be clearly set forth in the LEA

APPENDIX C: Protocol for Interventions for Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools

School Reform Plan.

The School Transformation Officer is accountable to ensure that the LEA:

- (i) Takes into account concerns of key stakeholders, especially parents and students;
- (ii) Has the requisite knowledge and analytic capacity to inform ongoing reform efforts and evaluate the efficacy of the implementation of such efforts; and,
- (iii) Is capable of producing evidence of well-informed and unflinching decisions that are made in the best interests of students despite outside pressures to accommodate the needs and demands of adults in the public education system.

3. LEA Community Outreach Requirements

All LEAs with schools identified as persistently lowest-achieving shall institute a comprehensive and ongoing plan for communication with affected students, families, educators, community leaders and organizations. The purpose of such a communication plan shall be to engage affected family and community members in the work of reforming affected schools in order to provide students with meaningful choices to access the most effective learning environments possible. At a minimum, LEA generated community outreach shall consist of the following components:

- (i) Ongoing mechanisms for meaningful and periodic family and community engagement in appropriate languages and a variety of delivery mechanisms;
- (ii) Usable and accessible information provided to students and their families about school options if their school has been identified as one of the state's persistently lowest-achieving schools;
- (iii) A communications strategy that fully explains a fair and equitable mechanism for student selection among available school choice options if the student's school is identified for reform under this Protocol (student choice must include a non-charter school option if the affected school is converted to a public charter school); and,
- (iv) A detailed transportation plan that accommodates students who desire to attend a school that is not currently served by the LEA's existing transportation plan.

4. LEA Selection of a School Reform Option

Once one or more schools are identified as one of the state's persistently lowest-achieving schools, the Superintendent of the affected LEA shall convene a local stakeholder group within 30 business days of such identification. The purpose of this stakeholder group is to serve as a focus group and to provide feedback to the Superintendent's preliminary recommendation as to which of the four reform models would be preferable given each individual school's context and need. The stakeholder group shall include:

- (1) the Commissioner of Elementary and Secondary Education, or designee;
- (2) the chair of the school committee, or designee;
- (3) the president of the local teacher's union, or designee;
- (4) an administrator from each of the identified schools, who may be the principal or other individual as chosen by the Superintendent;
- (5) a teacher from each identified school, selected by the principal and faculty of the school;
- (6) a parent from each identified school, selected by the principal and school-based parent organization;
- (7) a student or youth representative from each identified high school
- (8) representatives of applicable state and local social service, health, and child welfare agencies, chosen by the Superintendent; and,
- (9) as appropriate, representatives of state and local workforce development agencies, chosen by the

APPENDIX C: Protocol for Interventions for Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools

Superintendent.

The Superintendent shall consider the feedback from the local stakeholder group and submit to the Commissioner of Elementary and Secondary Education a letter of intent that specifies the recommended reform option that will be implemented in each school identified as persistently-lowest achieving. The letter of intent describing the reform option must be submitted for approval within 45 business days of designation as a persistently lowest-achieving school.

In the alternative, if the LEA is unable or unwilling to implement one of the four reform models outlined herein, the LEA shall provide notice of said inability to implement a reform within 45 business days of notification that one of its schools has been identified as one of the state persistently lowest-achieving schools. In the event that such notification is received by RIDE, that shall be considered to be cause to trigger the reconstitution authorities granted the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education and the Board of Regents pursuant to RIGL § 16-7.1-5.

Upon receipt, the Commissioner shall have 10 business days to approve or reject the selection of the school reform option.

5. LEA School Reform Plan

Upon the Commissioner's approval of a school reform option, the Superintendent shall reconvene the local stakeholder group in order to solicit input for the development of a comprehensive school reform plan ("Plan") based on the LEA's school reform choice. The purpose of reconvening this group is to make recommendations to the Superintendent in regard to the content of a reform plan that is specific to each identified school and which incorporates the required elements of the selected reform model as outlined in this Protocol. The Superintendent shall consider stakeholder input, but the Superintendent is responsible for designing a school reform plan based on student need and student outcome data.

At a minimum, the Plan shall meet the legal requirements for a "school plan" as set forth at 20 U.S.C. 6316(b) (3) in accordance with guidance from RIDE. It is critical that the Plan be sufficiently detailed in regard to governance, budget, staffing, instructional program, supports to students and staff, and other programmatic elements as needed to fully implement the reform elements set forth herein for the specific reform model chosen for each identified school.

The Superintendent shall have no more than 120 business days in which to draft a comprehensive school reform plan. There shall be substantial and meaningful opportunity for public comment and input during the 120 day period. The Superintendent will seek out assistance as needed from the Rhode Island Department of Education in the development of the Plan. The Superintendent shall give good faith consideration to all public input proposed modifications and comments and determine the need for modifications to the Plan prior to its submittal to the Commissioner. Within the 120 period described herein, the Superintendent shall submit the comprehensive school reform plan, complete with a school-based budget, to the Commissioner for approval. The Commissioner shall have 30 business days in which to approve, modify, or reject the Plan.

The Commissioner may, in consultation with the Superintendent, modify the proposed school reform plan if the Commissioner determines that:

- (i) The Plan, as written, fails to promote the rapid academic achievement of students in the applicable school;
- (ii) A component of the Plan was included, or a modification was excluded, on the basis of

APPENDIX C: Protocol for Interventions for Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools

demonstrably-false information or evidence; or,
(iii) The Plan fails to meet the substantive requirements of this Protocol.

All timelines set forth herein may be extended for good cause at the sole discretion of the Commissioner.

Once accepted by the Commissioner, the school reform plan shall be implemented over a three year period. The Commissioner shall cause the school to be evaluated in regard to its progress in implementing the Plan no less than annually. If progress is deemed to be insufficient, the Commissioner may require modifications to the Plan as needed to address unmet goals. If the school has substantially failed to meet multiple goals in the Plan, the Commissioner may appoint an external operator to manage the implementation of the plan; terminate the contract of an existing operator; or reconstitute the school pursuant to the authorities set forth at RIGL § 16-7.1-5. (See Section VII: Role of the State Education Agency). Conversely, the Commissioner may renew the Plan based on the Superintendent's or external operator's success in meeting the terms of the Plan. If the Commissioner determines after the expiration of the school reform plan that the school has improved sufficiently, the designation of the school as persistently lowest-achieving shall be removed.

VII. Role of State Education Agency

As the State Education Agency (SEA), the Rhode Island Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (RIDE) has three distinct roles to play in reforming the state's persistently lowest-achieving schools. First, it is the responsibility of the SEA to establish the standards and expectations for school performance and categorize schools based on that performance. Second, the state must provide assistance to those LEA's with identified schools in order to ensure that conditions at the school allow for meaningful reform. If the Department determines that the LEA is not meeting its goals, timelines, budget, or annual targets or is not fulfilling other applicable requirements, the Department will take appropriate enforcement action, which could include a collaborative process between the Department and the LEA, or any of the enforcement measures that are detailed in 34 CFR section 80.43, including putting the LEA on reimbursement payment status, temporarily withholding funds, or disallowing costs.

If the LEA is unable or unwilling to implement one of the four reform models outlined herein, the LEA shall provide notice of said inability to implement within 45 business days of notification that one of its schools has been identified as one of the state's persistently lowest-achieving schools. In the event that such notification is received by RIDE, that shall be cause to trigger the reconstitution authorities granted the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education and the Board of Regents pursuant to RIGL § 16-7.1-5. Section 16-7.1-5 reads, in pertinent part, as follows:

If after a three (3) year period of support there has not been improvement in the education of students as determined by objective criteria to be developed by the board of regents, then there shall be progressive levels of control by the department of elementary and secondary education over the school and/or district budget, program, and/or personnel. This control by the department of elementary and secondary education may be exercised in collaboration with the school district and the municipality. **If further needed, the school shall be reconstituted. Reconstitution responsibility is delegated to the board of regents and may range from restructuring the school's governance, budget, program, personnel, and/or may include decisions regarding the continued operation of the school.** The board of regents shall assess the district's capacity and may recommend the provision of additional district, municipal and/or state resources. If a

APPENDIX C: Protocol for Interventions for Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools

school or school district is under the board of regents' control as a result of actions taken by the board pursuant to this section, the local school committee shall be responsible for funding that school or school district at the same level as in the prior academic year increased by the same percentage as the state total of school aid is increased. (RIGL § 16-7.1-5) (emphasis added).

Reconstitution:

If the Commissioner decides that reconstitution is necessary in order to protect the rights of students in a specific school, the Commissioner may order the local school district to show cause why an administrative order placing the district under full state intervention should not be implemented. The local school committee may accede to the creation of a state-operated district or it may request a plenary hearing before a RIDE hearing officer to contest the show-cause order. In the plenary hearing the state has the burden of showing that the Commissioner's recommended administrative order is not arbitrary, unreasonable, or capricious.

Upon receiving the hearing officer's factual findings and recommendation, the Commissioner may modify the School Reform Plan, order the implementation of an LEA corrective action plan, or recommend that the Board of Regents issue an order either reconstituting the school, assigning the governance of the school to a third party operator, or closing the school. Upon issuance of any order by the Board of Regents affecting the operation of a school pursuant to RIGL § 16-7.1-5, the school committee may appeal the Board of Regents' decision in the Superior Court.

Should the Board of Regents exercise its authority to reconstitute or close a school due to persistently low student achievement, it becomes the responsibility of the SEA to determine how the school will then be managed. Section 16-7.1-5 allows the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education to share its control over the school in collaboration with the school district and the municipality. For the purposes of this Protocol, reconstitution shall mean turnaround, restart, or transformation as defined in Section 3.2. herein.

Unless the Regents specify otherwise in a particular case, reconstitution shall be presumed to take the affected school out of the LEA. Reform is required in our persistently lowest-achieving schools. If an LEA is unable or unwilling to institute the reforms described in this Protocol, then the school must be considered to be under the direct control of the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, which is then free to hire a Charter Management Organization (CMO) or an Education Management Organization (EMO) to operate the school. Said CMO or EMO then becomes a site-based employer. Although the current employer/employee relationship is interrupted, nothing herein shall be considered to limit whatever rights are available to the professional and support staff in regard to organizing and collectively bargaining compensation schemes, benefits, and working conditions with the new employer, subject to those conditions that may be established in an Order of Reconstitution.

Reconstitution orders may vary depending on the factual circumstances specific to each affected school. However, it is anticipated that all reconstitution schools will share the following characteristics in terms of control over program, personnel and budget:

Program: The school shall run on an extended school year and extended school day with before, after school, and summer learning opportunities and expanded student and family supports.

(i) There shall be flexible school and individual teacher schedules.

APPENDIX C: Protocol for Interventions for Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools

- (ii) The school shall have one or more significant community partnership(s) that support teaching and learning.
- (iii) Regular teacher contact with parents/families shall be required and monitored.
- (iv) A personalization plan for each student shall be developed and supported.
- (v) A literacy coach and a math coach shall be required in each school.

Personnel: The Principal (or Director) shall have recruiting, hiring, and dismissal authority of all staff members in their school. Current staff, including administrators and teachers, shall be required to reapply for jobs in the school.

- (i) Teacher assignment shall be a decision based on teacher expertise and the needs of students, not an entitlement driven by seniority.
- (ii) Teachers and administrators shall be evaluated annually.
- (iii) Additional hours for teacher/staff professional development and collaborative planning shall be required.
- (iv) The district and union shall incorporate mechanisms to address teacher assignment; flexible scheduling; and the role of department chairs or grade leaders.

Budget: The Principal (or Director) shall have control over the allocation of money, time, and programming.

- (i) Budgeting and decision-making shall revolve around the needs of students first.
- (ii) Teachers and administrators shall have a professional incentive system, (salaries that attract quality leaders and teachers; performance pay based on student success).
- (iii) There shall be differentiated roles for teachers and differentiated compensation based on those roles.

The Order of Reconstitution shall set forth clear, measurable performance targets for the affected school. Timelines for implementation of specific required tasks, along with the roles and responsibilities of various key stakeholders, together with the oversight responsibilities of the Department, shall be clear and unambiguous. There shall be an Office of School Transformation at RIDE that will have the responsibility of coordinating all communications and interactions between the reconstituted school and the SEA. Funding for the reconstituted school shall continue to come from the LEA in a manner to be determined by the Commissioner. Said funding may be supplemented by the State, again as may be determined by the Commissioner.

APPENDIX D : Needs Assessment Table

DOCUMENTATION OF LEA SELECTION OF A SCHOOL INTERVENTION OPTION

LEA Name:_____ Identified School Name:_____ Date:_____

1. The superintendent has analyzed the needs of the identified school, obtained input from the stakeholders about the four School Intervention Models, and has selected a School Intervention Option.

School Intervention Models	Was the Intervention model chosen for the LEA?		Please provide a detailed explanation to support the decision regarding each model.
	Yes	No	
School Closure			
Restart			
Turnaround			
Transformation			

APPENDIX D : Needs Assessment Table

2. For the School Intervention Model that the LEA has selected, please document the analysis that was completed for the each of the major areas listed below.

2a. Content of Instructional Program. This may include (but is not limited to): The rigor of the curriculum; Alignment with state standards; Data-based accountability; School and State-level Assessments; Extended learning opportunities

Evidence Reviewed: Identify all major sources of information used to analyze the needs of the identified school. This may include (but is not limited to) programs, documents, reports, and/or community feedback.

Major Findings: Using the information in the “Evidence Reviewed” column, summarize the results of the analysis.

APPENDIX D : Needs Assessment Table

2b. Leadership. This may include (but is not limited to): School, LEA and community leadership; Instructional leadership; Organizational structure; Oversight for accountability

Evidence Reviewed: Identify all major sources of information used to analyze the needs of the identified school. This may include (but is not limited to) programs, documents, reports, and/or community feedback.

Major Findings: Using the information in the “Evidence Reviewed” column, summarize the results of the analysis.

APPENDIX D : Needs Assessment Table

2c. Personnel Structure And Supports. This may include (but is not limited to): Staff competencies; Professional development; Rigorous evaluations; External resources and supports

Evidence Reviewed: Identify all major sources of information used to analyze the needs of the identified school. This may include (but is not limited to) programs, documents, reports, and/or community feedback.

Major Findings: Using the information in the “Evidence Reviewed” column, summarize the results of the analysis.

APPENDIX D : Needs Assessment Table

2d. Infrastructure. This may include (but is not limited to): School culture and climate; Community partnerships; Student, family and community supports; Resources	
Evidence Reviewed: Identify all major sources of information used to analyze the needs of the identified school. This may include (but is not limited to) programs, documents, reports, and/or community feedback.	Major Findings: Using the information in the “Evidence Reviewed” column, summarize the results of the analysis.

☐ **3. STATEMENT OF ASSURANCES:** The LEA assures that it is in possession of the documentation and evidence used to affirm the analyses listed above, and could provide them to the SEA upon request.

APPENDIX E: Waiver Requests

The RIDE provided the information below, regarding this waiver request, to the public by posting a notice on its website, a link to which was emailed to all the LEA superintendents and to all the LEA Title I directors. The waiver was posted to the RIDE website on January 28th, 2010, and during the intervening time, the RIDE provided opportunities for comment in a number of forums. No comments were submitted.

1. January 29th, 2010 Notice to Superintendent from Commissioner with link to website

From: Gist, Deborah [mailto:Deborah.Gist@RIDE.RI.GOV]

Sent: Friday, January 29, 2010 5:38 PM

To: SUPTS-L@LISTSERV.RI.NET

Subject: Weekly Field Memo to Superintendents - Week of January 25, 2010

Commissioner Deborah A. Gist's Weekly Field Memo

Friday, January 29th, 2010

**From the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (RIDE):
RIDE seeks comment from districts on Title I School Improvement Fund
application waiver request**

Please see this notice from the RIDE Title I office:

RIDE will be submitting an application to the United States Department of Education (US ED) in order to receive School Improvement Funds authorized under Section 1003(g) of the Title I Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA). The purpose of the Title I 1003(g) School Improvement Funds is to provide grants to Local Education Agencies (LEAs) with Title I schools in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring to raise the achievement of their students and enable the schools to make adequate yearly progress (AYP) and exit improvement status. The Title I 1003(g) School Improvement Funds are to be focused on the persistently lowest-achieving schools as defined under final requirements for the Title I 1003(g) School Improvement Funds published in the Federal Register in December 2009.

In its application to the US ED, we have the opportunity to request waivers of certain provisions of the ESEA. Before requesting these waivers, we must provide all interested LEAs in the state with notice and a reasonable opportunity to comment on the request.

A copy of the waiver request that we intend to submit as part of our application is posted at: http://www.ride.ri.gov/Special_Populations/Title1/default.aspx for your review and comment. All comments received from LEAs will be submitted as part of our application for Title I 1003(g) School Improvement Funds. Please submit all comments to Colleen Hedden, Title I Coordinator, at colleen.hedden@ride.ri.gov by February 12, 2010.

APPENDIX E: Waiver Requests

2. February 1, 2010 Notice to Title I Directors with link to website

From: Hedden, Colleen
Sent: Monday, February 01, 2010 11:45 AM
To: Title I Coordinators
Subject: Title I School Improvement 1003(g) Waivers

The Rhode Island Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (RIDE) will be submitting an application to the United States Department of Education (US ED) in order to receive School Improvement Funds authorized under Section 1003(g) of the Title I Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA). The purpose of the Title I 1003(g) School Improvement Funds is to provide grants to Local Education Agencies (LEAs) with Title I schools in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring to raise the achievement of their students and enable the schools to make adequate yearly progress (AYP) and exit improvement status. The Title I 1003(g) School Improvement Funds are to be focused on the persistently lowest-achieving schools as defined under final requirements for the Title I 1003(g) School Improvement Funds published in the Federal Register in December 2009.

In its application to the US ED, the RIDE has the opportunity to request waivers of certain provisions of the ESEA. Before requesting these waivers, the RIDE must provide all interested LEAs in the State with notice and a reasonable opportunity to comment on the request.

A copy of the waiver request that RIDE intends to submit as part of its application is attached and also posted at http://www.ride.ri.gov/Special_Populations/Title1/default.aspx for your review and comment. All comments received from LEAs will be submitted as part of the RIDE's application for Title I 1003(g) School Improvement Funds.

Please submit all comments to Colleen Hedden, Title I Coordinator, at colleen.hedden@ride.ri.gov by February 12, 2010.

Thank you,
Colleen Hedden
Title I Coordinator
RI Department of Education
Shepard Building
255 Westminster Street
Providence, RI 02903

Phone: (401) 222-8939
FAX: (401) 222- 60030
colleen.hedden@ride.ri.gov

APPENDIX E: Waiver Requests

3. Waiver Introductory Comment for website, posted January 28, 2010

The Rhode Island Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (RIDE) will be submitting an application to the United States Department of Education (US ED) in order to receive School Improvement Funds authorized under Section 1003(g) of the Title I Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA). The purpose of the Title I 1003(g) School Improvement Funds is to provide grants to Local Education Agencies (LEAs) with Title I schools in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring to raise the achievement of their students and enable the schools to make adequate yearly progress (AYP) and exit improvement status. The Title I 1003(g) School Improvement Funds are to be focused on the persistently lowest-achieving schools as defined under final requirements for the Title I 1003(g) School Improvement Funds published in the Federal Register in December 2009.

In its application to the US ED, the RIDE has the opportunity to request waivers of certain provisions of the ESEA. Before requesting these waivers, the RIDE must provide all interested LEAs in the State with notice and a reasonable opportunity to comment on the request.

A copy of the waiver request that RIDE intends to submit as part of its application is attached for your review and comment. All comments received from LEAs will be submitted as part of the RIDE's application for Title I 1003(g) School Improvement Funds. Please submit all comment to Colleen Hedden, Title I Coordinator, at colleen.hedden@ride.ri.gov by February 12, 2010.

4. Copy of Waiver Request posted on website January 28, 2010

WAIVERS: The final requirements invite an SEA to request waivers of the requirements set forth below. An SEA must list in its application those requirements for which it is seeking a waiver.

Rhode Island requests a waiver of the requirements it has listed below. These waivers would allow any local educational agency (LEA) in the State that receives a School Improvement Grant to use those funds in accordance with the final requirements for School Improvement Grants and the LEA's application for a grant.

The State believes that the requested waiver(s) will increase the quality of instruction for students and improve the academic achievement of students in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools by enabling an LEA to use more effectively the school improvement funds to implement one of the four school intervention models in its Tier I or Tier II schools and to carry out school improvement activities in its Tier III schools. The four school intervention models are specifically designed to raise substantially the achievement of students in the State's Tier I and Tier II schools.

APPENDIX E: Waiver Requests

- ✓ Waive section 421(b) of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. § 1225(b)) to extend the period of availability of school improvement funds for the SEA and all of its LEAs to September 30, 2013.
- ✓ Waive section 1116(b) (12) of the ESEA to permit LEAs to allow their Tier I and Tier II Title I participating schools that will implement a turnaround or restart model to “start over” in the school improvement timeline.
- ✓ Waive the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold in section 1114(a)(1) of the ESEA to permit LEAs to implement a schoolwide program in a Tier I or Tier II Title I participating school that does not meet the poverty threshold.

The State assures that it will ensure that any LEA that chooses to implement one or more of these waivers will comply with section II.A.8 of the final requirements.

The State assures that it will permit an LEA to implement the waiver(s) only if the LEA receives a School Improvement Grant and requests to implement the waiver(s) in its application. As such, the LEA may only implement the waiver(s) in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, as applicable, included in its application.

The State assures that, prior to submitting this request in its School Improvement Grant application, the State provided all LEAs in the State that are eligible to receive a School Improvement Grant with notice and a reasonable opportunity to comment on this request and has attached a copy of that notice as well as copies of any comments it received from LEAs. The State also assures that it provided notice and information regarding this waiver request to the public in the manner in which the State customarily provides such notice and information to the public (*e.g.*, by publishing a notice in the newspaper; by posting information on its Web site) and has attached a copy of, or link to, that notice.

The State assures that, if it is granted one or more of the waivers requested above, it will submit to the U.S. Department of Education a report that sets forth the name and NCES District Identification Number for each LEA implementing a waiver, including which specific waivers each LEA is implementing.

July 1, 2010

RHODE ISLAND DEPARTMENT OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

APPLICATION COVER SHEET

TITLE I 1003(g) SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

Applicant Agency:	Mailing Address:
LEA Contact Information for the Title I, 1003(g) School Improvement Grant	
Name:	
Contact's Mailing Address:	
Telephone:	
Fax:	
Email address:	
Superintendent (Printed Name):	Telephone:
Signature of the Chief State School Officer:	Date:
X_____	

LEA APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS

A. SCHOOLS TO BE SERVED: An LEA must include the following information with respect to the schools it will serve with a School Improvement Grant.

An LEA must list each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school it commits to serve and identify the model that the LEA will use in each Tier I and Tier II school.

SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID #	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	INTERVENTION (TIER I AND II ONLY)			
					turnaround	restart	closure	transformation

Note: An LEA that has nine or more Tier I and Tier II schools may not implement the transformation model in more than 50 percent of those schools.

B. DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION: An LEA must include the following information in its application for a School Improvement Grant.

In order to complete this application for SIG 1003(g) funds, each LEA must provide the RIDE with the following documentation. Under each question is a box with a gray header, to provide space for the LEA's response. If the requested documentation has already been submitted to the RIDE in accordance with *The Protocol for Interventions: Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools* (The Protocol), and is on file, it is sufficient for the LEA to indicate the date of submission. Similarly, if documentation is incorporated into the LEA's School Reform Plan (and that plan is attached to this application), it is sufficient for the LEA to provide the page number and specific reference.

1. For each Tier I and Tier II school that the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must demonstrate that the LEA has analyzed the needs of each school and selected an intervention for each school

Please provide documentation of the following as evidence that the LEA has analyzed the needs of each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application and has selected an intervention for each school.

A. Designation of a Single Point of Contact: *The Protocol, page 10 specifies that "The LEA must manage its school reform efforts under the leadership of a school transformation officer... who is responsible for ensuring that all applicable legal requirements are met during the reform process, including adherence to this Protocol."*

In the space below, please identify the LEA's Single Point of Contact:

--

B. Convening of the Local Stakeholder Group: *The Protocol, page 11 specifies that "This stakeholder group is to serve as a focus group and to provide feedback to the Superintendent's preliminary recommendation as to which of the four reform models would be preferable given each individual school's context and need. The stakeholder group shall include: (1) the Commissioner of Elementary and Secondary Education, or designee; (2) the chair of the school committee, or designee; (3) the president of the local teacher's union, or designee; (4) an administrator from each of the identified schools, who may be the principal or other individual as chosen by the Superintendent; (5) a teacher from each identified school, selected by the principal and faculty of the school; (6) a parent from each identified school, selected by the principal and school-based parent organization; (7) a student or youth representative from each identified high school (8) representatives of applicable state and local social service, health, and child welfare agencies, chosen by the Superintendent; and, (9) as appropriate, representatives of state and local workforce development agencies, chosen by the Superintendent"*

In the space below, please identify the members of the LEA's Local Stakeholder Group:

--

C. A Letter of Intent: *The Protocol, page 11 specifies that “The Superintendent shall consider the feedback from the local stakeholder group and submit to the Commissioner of Elementary and Secondary Education a letter of intent that specifies the recommended reform option that will be implemented in each school identified as persistently-lowest achieving. The letter of intent describing the reform option must be submitted for approval within 45 days of designation as a persistently lowest-achieving school.”*

Please attach a copy of the LEA’s Letter Of Intent.

D. Needs Analysis Table *The LEA shall complete a Needs Analysis Table (attached) to provide detailed documentation of the process undertaken to analyze the needs of the identified school and select a School Intervention Model.*

Please complete the Needs Analysis Table, attached in Appendix A.

2. For each Tier I and Tier II school that the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must demonstrate that the LEA has the capacity to use school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA’s application in order to implement, fully and effectively, the required activities of the school intervention model it has selected.

Please provide documentation of the following as evidence that the LEA has the capacity to use school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA’s application in order to implement, fully and effectively, the required activities of the school intervention model it has selected.

A. Internal Accountability Framework: *The Protocol, page 7 specifies “Regardless of the reform model selected for an identified school, the LEA must have an effective internal accountability framework that:*

- (i) Generates and focuses attention on data-based information relevant to teaching and learning;*
- (ii) Provides opportunities for educators (and others) to attend not only to current information and programs, but to augment or change strategies in response to this information;*
- (iii) Develops the knowledge and skills to promote valid interpretation of the information; and,*
- (iv) Allocates resources where they are most needed.”*

In the space below, please describe the actions that the LEA has taken to address elements (i) - (iv), above.

--

B. Plan for Community Outreach: *The Protocol, page 10-11 specifies “All LEA’s... shall institute a comprehensive and ongoing plan for communication with affected students, families, educators, community leaders and organizations... to engage affected family and community members in the work of reforming affected schools in order to provide students with meaningful choices to access the most effective learning environments possible. At a minimum, LEA generated community outreach shall consist of the following components: (i) Ongoing mechanisms for meaningful and periodic family and community engagement in appropriate languages and a variety of delivery mechanisms; (ii) Usable and accessible information provided to students and their families about school options if their school has been identified as one of the state’s persistently lowest-achieving schools; (iii) A communications strategy that fully explains a fair and equitable mechanism for student selection among available school choice options if the student’s school is identified for reform under this Protocol (student choice must include a non-charter school option if the affected school is converted to a public charter school); and, (iv) A detailed transportation plan that accommodates students who desire to attend a school that is not currently served by the LEA’s existing transportation plan”*

In the space below, please describe the LEA’s Plan for Community Outreach:

3. If the LEA is not applying to serve each Tier I school, the LEA must explain why it lacks capacity to serve each Tier I school.

☐ Is the LEA applying to serve all of its Tier I schools? If so, check here and skip to question 4 (page 6).

☐ Is the LEA **not** applying to serve all of its Tier I schools? If this is the case, the LEA must check here and provide evidence for why it lacks the capacity to serve all of its Tier I schools, by responding to some or all of questions 3A-3E below, as relevant.

A. Lacking an Internal Accountability Framework: *The Protocol, page 7 specifies that “the LEA must have an effective internal accountability framework that:*

- (i) Generates and focuses attention on data-based information relevant to teaching and learning;*
- (ii) Provides opportunities for educators (and others) to attend not only to current information and programs, but to augment or change strategies in response to this information;*
- (iii) Develops the knowledge and skills to promote valid interpretation of the information; and,*
- (iv) Allocates resources where they are most needed”*

In the space below, explain why the LEA lacks the capacity to address elements (i) - (iv) above.

B. Lacking the Designation of a Single Point of Contact: *The Protocol, page 10 specifies that “The LEA must manage its school reform efforts under the leadership of a school transformation officer... who is responsible for ensuring that all applicable legal requirements are met during the reform process, including adherence to this Protocol.”*

If the LEA does not have and/or cannot designate a Single Point of Contact, please explain why, in the space below:

C. Lacking a Plan for Community Outreach: *The Protocol, page 10-11 specifies that “All LEA’s... shall institute a comprehensive and ongoing plan for communication with affected students, families, educators, community leaders and organizations... to engage affected family and community members in the work of reforming affected schools in order to provide students with meaningful choices to access the most effective learning environments possible. At a minimum, LEA generated community outreach shall consist of the following components: (i) Ongoing mechanisms for meaningful and periodic family and community engagement in appropriate languages and a variety of delivery mechanisms; (ii) Usable and accessible information provided to students and their families about school options if their school has been identified as one of the state’s persistently lowest-achieving schools; (iii) A communications strategy that fully explains a fair and equitable mechanism for student selection among available school choice options if the student’s school is identified for reform under this Protocol (student choice must include a non-charter school option if the affected school is converted to a public charter school); and, (iv) A detailed transportation plan that accommodates students who desire to attend a school that is not currently served by the LEA’s existing transportation plan”*

If the LEA does not have and/or cannot implement a Plan for Community Outreach, please explain why, in the space below:

D. Lacking a School Reform Plan: *The Protocol, page 12 specifies that “The School Reform Plan at a minimum, shall meet the legal requirements for a “school plan” as set forth at 20 U.S.C. 6316(b) (3) in accordance with guidance from the RIDE. It is critical that the Plan be sufficiently detailed in regard to governance, budget, staffing, instructional program, supports to students and staff, and other programmatic elements as needed to fully implement the reform elements set forth herein for the specific School Intervention Model chosen for each identified school.”*

If the LEA does not have and/or cannot create a School Reform Plan, please explain why, in the space below:

E. Failure to Negotiate: Additionally, an LEA may demonstrate that it lacks capacity to implement a School Intervention Model if the parties to any applicable collective bargaining agreement fail to negotiate any term or condition in a collective bargaining agreement necessary to meet the criteria for full implementation of the identified School Intervention Model.

If the parties to any applicable collective bargaining agreement are unable to negotiate any term or condition in a collective bargaining agreement necessary to meet the criteria for full implementation of the identified School Intervention Model, please explain the situation in the space below:

4. The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to—

A. Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements.

Please attach the following as evidence of the actions that the LEA has taken, or will take, to design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements.

I. School Reform Plan: *The Protocol, page 12 specifies that “The School Reform Plan at a minimum, shall meet the legal requirements for a “school plan” as set forth at 20 U.S.C. 6316(b) (3) in accordance with guidance from the RIDE. It is critical that the Plan be sufficiently detailed in regard to governance, budget, staffing, instructional program, supports to students and staff, and other programmatic elements as needed to fully implement the reform elements set forth herein for the specific School Intervention Model chosen for each identified school.”*

Please attach a copy of the LEA’s School Reform Plan

II. Public Comment: *The Protocol, page 12 specifies that “The Superintendent shall provide substantial and meaningful opportunity for public comment and input during the 120 day period. The Superintendent shall give good faith consideration to all public input proposed modifications and comments and determine the need for modifications to the Plan. ”*

In the space below, please describe the actions that the LEA has taken, or will take, to provide substantial and meaningful opportunity for public comment and input:

B. Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality.

Please provide documentation of the following as evidence of the actions that the LEA has taken, or will take, to recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality.

I. A Sufficient Vetting and Selection Process: *The Protocol, page 5 specifies that “The Commissioner must agree that the entity chosen by the LEA, through a process that adheres to local and state procurement requirements, is sufficiently vetted to reasonably ensure that the performance of the school under its management will significantly outperform the past performance of the school”*

In the space below, please describe the actions that the LEA has taken, or will take, to recruit, screen, and select external providers to ensure their quality.

C. Align other resources with the interventions.

Please provide documentation of the following as evidence of the actions that the LEA has taken, or will take, to align other resources with the interventions.

I. Coordination: *The School Reform Plan submitted by each LEA must reflect the coordination of local and federal resources with SIG funds in ways that support the successful implementation of the LEA’s chosen School Intervention Model. Additionally an LEA must identify all other funding sources that could be utilized to support activities in a coordinated manner.*

In the space below, please describe the actions that the LEA has taken, or will take, to coordinate funds:

D. Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively.

Please describe the actions that the LEA has taken, or will take, to modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively.

I. Utilizing the RIDE's Designated School Reform Strategies: *The Protocol, page 7 provides a list of strategies that **must** be incorporated into the LEA's School Reform Plan.*

Please provide evidence of actions that the LEA has taken, or will take, to utilize the RIDE's Designated School Reform Strategies (Page 1 of 2)		
Designated School Reform Strategy	Actions to date	Future Actions
Flexible funding at the school level to the extent authorized by applicable law; including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collective bargaining agreements that permit hiring without regard to seniority, • Or, alternatively, to comply with existing legal requirements regarding assignment of education professionals. 		
Comprehensive instructional reform, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved instructional programs and differentiated instruction; 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modifications to scheduling to increase learning time for students and maximize collaboration time for teachers - consider extended learning time, modified or block scheduling; and, 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Periodic reviews to ensure that the curriculum is being implemented with fidelity, is having the intended impact on student achievement, and is modified if ineffective; 		

Please provide evidence of actions that the LEA has taken, or will take, to utilize the RIDE's Designated School Reform Strategies, Continued (Page 2 of 2)		
Designated School Reform Strategy	Actions to date	Future Actions
Improved teacher and school leader effectiveness, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of valid and reliable pathways for bringing talented leadership into the schools affected by LEA reform efforts, as well as ongoing supports to administrators and teacher leaders in such schools once reform under The Protocol is instituted; 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports and professional development to teachers and principals in order to implement effective strategies to support students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment and to ensure that limited English proficient students acquire language skills to master academic content; 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assurances that school-based leaders have access to relevant data regarding school, educator and student performance, as well as the ability to perform and/or access meaningful diagnostic analysis to ensure that available data is used to inform decisions regarding ongoing reform efforts; 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluation of all professional staff in accordance with State standards. 		

II. Good-Faith Efforts to Negotiate: *The Protocol, page 3 specifies that “The parties to any applicable collective bargaining agreement will use their best good-faith efforts to negotiate any terms and conditions in the agreement necessary for the full implementation of the identified School Intervention Model for an identified Tier I or Tier II school. The parties shall understand that the failure to negotiate any term or condition in a collective bargaining agreement necessary to meet the criteria for full implementation of the identified school reform model will result in the termination of applicable grants relevant to implementation of said reform model.”*

In the space below, please describe the actions that the LEA has taken, or will take, to make a good-faith effort to negotiate:

III. Local Support for Change: *In order to modify some practices and policies, an LEA may require the support of members of some or all of the following key groups: The School Committee, LEA Leaders, Teachers Unions, and Municipal and Community Leaders. Therefore, the RIDE will look for indicators that those bodies are willing to support the LEA’s efforts and are agreeable to examining any changes that may need to occur.*

In the space below, please describe how the LEA has built, or will build, relationships with these key groups to garner their support for modifying practices and policies through the grant period.

E. Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.

Please describe the actions that the LEA has taken, or will take, to sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.

I. Short-Term Spending With Long-Term Impact: *Reform efforts that immediately and sustainably increase capacity but do not require the long-term use of funds. This may include intensive professional development efforts; lasting adjustments to school calendars/time; recruitment, placement, and retention of effective staff; the implementation of an instructional program that is research-based and vertically aligned; the establishment of a system of student data use that informs and differentiates instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students; partnerships with other organizations that will improve students' experience in school; and the creation of a rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for teachers and principals. The RIDE will consider these and other projects that utilize short-term spending with long-term impact, to be sustainable.*

In the space below, please describe the actions that the LEA has taken, or will take, to utilize short-term spending with long-term impact:

II. Sustainability: *A sustainable budget is one that decreases funding each year to minimize the funding cliff at the end of the grant period, or may secure funding from other sources to maintain funding levels once the granting period is over.*

In the space below, please describe the actions that the LEA has taken, or will take, to budget sustainably:

5. The LEA must include a timeline delineating the steps it will take to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA’s application.

A blank timeline for each School Intervention Model is attached to this application. The LEA should use this timeline to align its planned actions with the required elements of the model, and to identify when these actions will take place. Additionally, the LEA should use this timeline to note the occurrences of local assessments, that are aligned with state standards, that will serve as benchmarks. The timeline ensures that the LEA has the ability to get the basic elements of its selected models up and running by the beginning of the 2010–2011 school year, and will be reviewed quarterly for compliance.

Please complete the timeline for your selected School Intervention Model, found in Appendix B

6. The LEA must describe the annual goals for student achievement on the State’s assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics that it has established in order to monitor each Tier I and Tier II schools that receive school improvement funds. One set of the charts below (consisting of 4 *Math Goals Charts*, and 4 *Reading Goals Charts*) must be completed for each school; duplicate as needed.

Math Goals (1): Address the number of students scoring “proficient” or “proficient with distinction.”	Baseline data and annual targets			
	<i>Baseline: Fall 2009 Testing Data</i>	<i>Fall 2010 Data</i>	<i>Fall 2011 Data</i>	<i>Fall 2012 Data</i>

Math Goals (2): Address the number of students scoring “substantially below proficient.”	Baseline data and annual targets			
	<i>Baseline: Fall 2009 Testing Data</i>	<i>Fall 2010 Data</i>	<i>Fall 2011 Data</i>	<i>Fall 2012 Data</i>

July 1, 2010

Math Goal s (3): Address significant gaps in student subgroup scores.	Baseline data and annual targets			
	<i>Baseline: Fall 2009 Testing Data</i>	<i>Fall 2010 Data</i>	<i>Fall 2011 Data</i>	<i>Fall 2012 Data</i>

Math Goal s (4): Additional LEA goals.	Baseline data and annual targets			
	<i>Baseline: Fall 2009 Testing Data</i>	<i>Fall 2010 Data</i>	<i>Fall 2011 Data</i>	<i>Fall 2012 Data</i>

Reading/Language Arts Goals (1): Address the number of students scoring “proficient” or “proficient with distinction.”	Baseline data and annual targets			
	<i>Baseline: Fall 2009 Testing Data</i>	<i>Fall 2010 Data</i>	<i>Fall 2011 Data</i>	<i>Fall 2012 Data</i>

July 1, 2010

Reading/Language Arts Goals (2): Address the number of students scoring “substantially below proficient.”	Baseline data and annual targets			
	<i>Baseline: Fall 2009 Testing Data</i>	<i>Fall 2010 Data</i>	<i>Fall 2011 Data</i>	<i>Fall 2012 Data</i>
Reading/Language Arts Goals (3): Address significant gaps in student subgroup scores.	Baseline data and annual targets			
	<i>Baseline: Fall 2009 Testing Data</i>	<i>Fall 2010 Data</i>	<i>Fall 2011 Data</i>	<i>Fall 2012 Data</i>
Reading/Language Arts Goals (4): Additional LEA goals.	Baseline data and annual targets			
	<i>Baseline: Fall 2009 Testing Data</i>	<i>Fall 2010 Data</i>	<i>Fall 2011 Data</i>	<i>Fall 2012 Data</i>

7. For each Tier III school the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must identify the services the school will receive or the activities the school will implement. If the LEA is not proposing to serve any Tier III schools, please skip to question 10.

Tier III School Name	Area of Need	Services Received / Activities Implemented

8. The LEA must describe the goals it has established (subject to approval by the SEA) in order to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds. If the LEA is not proposing to serve any Tier III schools, please skip to question 10.

Accountability Goals for Tier III Schools	Baseline data and annual targets			
	Baseline: Fall 2009 Testing Data	Fall 2010 Data	Fall 2011 Data	Fall 2012 Data

An LEA might establish for its Tier III schools the same student achievement goals that it establishes for its Tier I and Tier II schools, or it might establish for its Tier III schools goals that align with the already existing AYP requirements, such as meeting the State's Annual Measurable Objectives or making AYP through safe harbor. (Question H-26, Federal Guidance on School Improvement Grants)

9. As appropriate, the LEA must consult with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA's application and implementation of school improvement models in its Tier I and Tier II schools.

This question is satisfied by the response to 1B above.

July 1, 2010

10. Please provide baseline data for the following indicators as outlined in Section III of the final requirements. Data on these indicators must be provided annually by LEAs that receive SIG funds. If an LEA does not currently collect data on one or more of the indicators below, it must provide information on how that data will be collected throughout the granting period.

One copy of the chart below must be completed for each school; duplicate as needed.

Indicators (page 1 of 2)	School Year 2009-2010 Baseline Data	
AYP status		
Which AYP targets the school met and missed		
School improvement status		
Number of minutes within the school year		
Percentage of students at or above each proficiency level on State assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics (e.g., Basic, Proficient, Advanced), by grade and by student subgroup		
Student participation rate on State assessments in reading/language arts and in mathematics, by student subgroup		
Average scale scores on State assessments in reading/language arts and in mathematics, by grade, for the “all students” group, for each achievement quartile, and for each subgroup		
Percentage of limited English proficient students who attain English language proficiency		
Graduation rate		
Dropout rate		
Student attendance rate		

Indicators (page 2 of 2)	School Year 2009-2010 Baseline Data	
Number and percentage of students completing advanced coursework (e.g., AP/IB), early-college high schools, or dual enrollment classes		
College enrollment rates		
Discipline incidents		
Truants		
Distribution of teachers by performance level on LEA's teacher evaluation system		
Teacher attendance rate		

C. BUDGET: An LEA must include a budget that indicates the amount of school improvement funds the LEA will use each year in each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school it commits to serve.

The LEA must provide a budget that indicates the amount of school improvement funds the LEA will use each year to—

- Implement the selected model in each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve;
- Conduct LEA-level activities designed to support implementation of the selected school intervention models in the LEA's Tier I and Tier II schools; and
- Support school improvement activities, at the school or LEA level, for each Tier III school identified in the LEA's application.

Note: An LEA's budget must cover the period of availability, including any extension granted through a waiver, and be of sufficient size and scope to implement the selected school intervention model in each Tier I and Tier II school the LEA commits to serve.

An LEA's budget for each year may not be less than \$50,000 nor more than \$2,000,000 per participating school.

D. ASSURANCES: An LEA must include the following assurances in its application for a School Improvement Grant.

The LEA must assure that it will—

- (1) Use its School Improvement Grant to implement fully and effectively an intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school that the LEA commits to serve consistent with the final requirements;
- (2) Establish annual goals for student achievement on the State's assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics and measure progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements in order to monitor each Tier I and Tier II school that it serves with school improvement funds, and establish goals (approved by the SEA) to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds;
- (3) If it implements a restart model in a Tier I or Tier II school, include in its contract or agreement terms and provisions to hold the charter operator, charter management organization, or education management organization accountable for complying with the final requirements; and
- (4) Report to the SEA the school-level data required under section III of the final requirements.

E. WAIVERS: If the SEA has requested any waivers of requirements applicable to the LEA's School Improvement Grant, an LEA must indicate which of those waivers it intends to implement.

The LEA must check each waiver that the LEA will implement. If the LEA does not intend to implement the waiver with respect to each applicable school, the LEA must indicate for which schools it will implement the waiver.

- ☐ Extending the period of availability of school improvement funds.

Note: If an SEA has requested and received a waiver of the period of availability of school improvement funds, that waiver automatically applies to all LEAs in the State.

- ☐ "Starting over" in the school improvement timeline for Tier I and Tier II Title I participating schools implementing a turnaround or restart model.
- ☐ Implementing a schoolwide program in a Tier I or Tier II Title I participating school that does not meet the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold.

Note: If an SEA has not requested and received a waiver of any of these requirements, an LEA may submit a request to the Secretary.

Appendix A

DOCUMENTATION OF LEA SELECTION OF A SCHOOL INTERVENTION MODELS

LEA Name:_____ Identified School Name:_____ Date:_____

1. The superintendent has analyzed the needs of the identified school, obtained input from the stakeholders about the four School Intervention Models, and has selected a School Intervention Option.

School Intervention Models	Was the Intervention model chosen for the LEA?		Please provide a detailed explanation to support the decision regarding each model.
	Yes	No	
School Closure			
Restart			
Turnaround			
Transformation			

2. For the School Intervention Model that the LEA has selected, please document the analysis that was completed for the each of the major areas listed below.

2a. <u>Content of Instructional Program</u> . This may include(but is not limited to): The rigor of the curriculum; Alignment with state standards; Data-based accountability; School and State-level Assessments; Extended learning opportunities	
Evidence Reviewed : Identify all major sources of information used by to analyze the needs of the identified school. This may include (but is not limited to) programs, documents, reports, and/or community feedback.	Major Findings: Using the information in the “Evidence Reviewed” column, summarize the results of the analysis.

2b. <u>Leadership</u> . This may include (but is not limited to): School, LEA and community leadership; Instructional leadership; Organizational structure; Oversight for accountability	
Evidence Reviewed: Identify all major sources of information used by to analyze the needs of the identified school. This may include (but is not limited to) programs, documents, reports, and/or community feedback.	Major Findings: Using the information in the “Evidence Reviewed” column, summarize the results of the analysis.

2c. Personnel Structure And Supports. This may include(but is not limited to): Staff competencies; Professional development; Rigorous evaluations; External resources and supports

Evidence Reviewed : Identify all major sources of information used by to analyze the needs of the identified school. This may include (but is not limited to) programs, documents, reports, and/or community feedback.

Major Findings: Using the information in the “Evidence Reviewed” column, summarize the results of the analysis.

--	--

2d. <u>Infrastructure</u> . This may include (but is not limited to): School culture and climate; Community partnerships; Student, family and community supports; Resources	
Evidence Reviewed: Identify all major sources of information used by to analyze the needs of the identified school. This may include (but is not limited to) programs, documents, reports, and/or community feedback.	Major Findings: Using the information in the “Evidence Reviewed” column, summarize the results of the analysis.

☐ **3. STATEMENT OF ASSURANCES:** The LEA assures that it is in possession of the documentation and evidence used to affirm the analyses listed above, and could provide them to the SEA upon request.

TRANSFORMATION MODEL (CONTINUED, page 2)		JULY 2010	AUG 2010	SEPT 2010	OCT 2010	NOV 2010	DEC 2010	JAN 2011	FEB 2011	MARC H 2011	APRIL 2011	MAY 2011	JUNE 2011
4. Identify and remove those school leaders, teachers, and other staff who, after ample opportunities have been provided for them to improve their professional practice, have not done so;													
5. Provide staff ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program and designed with school staff to ensure they are equipped to facilitate effective teaching and learning and have the capacity to successfully implement school reform strategies.													
6. Implement such strategies as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in a transformation model.													

School Turnaround Timeline: 3 pages

TIMELINE OF REQUIRED ACTIVITIES for the TURNAROUND MODEL	School Year 2010-2011 TIMELINE	In the space below, please indicate WHEN actions will be taken to satisfy the requirements of the Transformation Model, and WHAT THE ACTIONS WILL BE, specific to the Tier I or Tier II School											
		JULY 2010	AUG 2010	SEPT 2010	OCT 2010	NOV 2010	DEC 2010	JAN 2011	FEB 2011	MARC H 2011	APRIL 2011	MAY 2011	JUNE 2011
1. Replace the principal who led the school prior to commencement of the turnaround model.													
2. Grant the new principal sufficient operational flexibility (including in staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting) to implement fully a comprehensive approach in order to substantially improve student achievement outcomes and increase high school graduation rates.													
3. Use locally adopted competencies to measure the effectiveness of staff who can work within the turnaround environment to meet the needs of students, and: A. Screen all existing staff and rehire no more than 50 percent B. Select new staff													

TURNAROUND MODEL (CONTINUED page 2)		JULY 2010	AUG 2010	SEPT 2010	OCT 2010	NOV 2010	DEC 2010	JAN 2011	FEB 2011	MARC H 2011	APRIL 2011	MAY 2011	JUNE 2011
4. Implement such strategies as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in the turnaround school													
5. Provide staff ongoing, high-quality job-embedded professional development that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program and designed with school staff to ensure that they are equipped to facilitate effective teaching and learning and have the capacity to successfully implement school reform strategies;													
6. Adopt a new governance structure, which may include, but is not limited to, requiring the school to report to a new "turnaround office" in the LEA or SEA, hire a "turnaround leader" who reports directly to the Superintendent or Chief Academic Officer, or enter into a multi-year contract with the LEA or SEA to obtain added flexibility in exchange for greater accountability													

TURNAROUND MODEL (CONTINUED, page 3)		JULY 2010	AUG 2010	SEPT 2010	OCT 2010	NOV 2010	DEC 2010	JAN 2011	FEB 2011	MARC H 2011	APRIL 2011	MAY 2011	JUNE 2011
7. Use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with State academic standard													
8. Promote the continuous use of student data (such as from formative, interim, and summative assessments) to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students													
9. Establish schedules and implement strategies that provide increased learning time													
10. Provide appropriate social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports for students													

Note: The LEA may choose to also undertake any or all of the strategies laid out in the Transformation Model (above).

School Restart Timeline: 2 pages

TIMELINE OF REQUIRED ACTIVITIES for the RESTART MODEL	School Year 2010-2011	In the space below, please indicate WHEN actions will be taken to satisfy the requirements of the Transformation Model, and WHAT THE ACTIONS WILL BE, specific to the Tier I or Tier II School											
		JULY 2010	AUG 2010	SEPT 2010	OCT 2010	NOV 2010	DEC 2010	JAN 2011	FEB 2011	MAR 2011	APRIL 2011	MAY 2011	JUNE 2011
1. Conduct a rigorous review process to select a charter school operator, a charter management organization (CMO), or an education management organization (EMO) to convert or close and reopen the identified school. <i>SEE NOTE 1</i>													
2. Enroll, within the grades the restart school serves, all former students who wish to attend the school. This requirement ensures that restarting the school benefits the population of students who would be served by the school in the absence of “restarting” the school. The obligation to enroll any former student who wishes to attend the school includes the obligation to enroll a student who did not actually previously attend the school — for example, because the student was previously enrolled in grade 3 but the school serves only grades 4 through 6 — but who would now be able to enroll in the school were it not implementing the restart model. If the restart school no longer serves a particular grade or grades													

that previously had been served by the school, the restart school is not obligated to enroll a student in the grade or grades that are no longer served. <i>SEE NOTE 2</i>													
3. The school implement any of the required or permissible activities of a turnaround model or a transformation model. The restart model is specifically intended to give operators flexibility and freedom to implement their own reform plans and strategies.													
RESTART MODEL (CONTINUED, page 2)		JULY 2010	AUG 2010	SEPT 2010	OCT 2010	NOV 2010	DEC 2010	JAN 2011	FEB 2011	MARC H 2011	APRIL 2011	MAY 2011	JUNE 2011

NOTE 1: The “rigorous review process” permits an LEA to examine a prospective restart operator’s reform plans and strategies. It helps prevent an operator from assuming control of a school without having a meaningful plan for turning it around. The purpose of the rigorous review process is to provide an LEA with an opportunity to ensure that the operator will use this model to make meaningful changes in a school. Through the rigorous review process, an LEA might, for example, require a prospective operator to demonstrate that its strategies are research-based and that it has the capacity to implement the strategies it is proposing.

NOTE 2: A restart school may serve fewer grades than were previously served by the school in which the model is being implemented. An LEA has flexibility to work with providers to develop the appropriate sequence and timetable for a restart partnership. Thus, for example, an LEA could allow a restart operator to take over one grade in the school at a time.

If an LEA allows a restart operator to serve only some of the grades that were previously served by the school in which the model is being implemented, the LEA must ensure that the SIG funds it receives for the school are used only for the grades being served by the restart operator, unless the LEA is implementing one of the other SIG models with respect to the other grades served by the school. For example, if the school in question previously served grades K-6 and the LEA allows a restart operator to take over the school only with respect to grades K-3, the LEA could use SIG funds to serve the students in grades 4-6 if it implements a turnaround model or school closure, consistent with the final requirements, with respect to those grades.

TIMELINE OF REQUIRED ACTIVITIES for SCHOOL CLOSURE	School Year 2010-2011 TIMELINE	In the space below, please indicate WHEN actions will be taken to satisfy the requirements of the Transformation Model, and WHAT THE ACTIONS WILL BE, specific to the Tier I or Tier II School											
		JULY 2010	AUG 2010	SEPT 2010	OCT 2010	NOV 2010	DEC 2010	JAN 2011	FEB 2011	MAR 2011	APRIL 2011	MAY 2011	JUNE 2011
1. Identify a higher achieving school or schools “within reasonable proximity” to the closed school, which students from the closed school will attend. <i>SEE NOTE</i>													
2. Use SIG funds to pay certain reasonable and necessary costs associated with closing the school, such as costs related to parent and community outreach, including, but not limited to, press releases, newsletters, newspaper announcements, hotlines, direct mail notices, or meetings regarding the school closure; services to help parents and students transition to a new school; or orientation activities, including open houses, that are specifically designed for students attending a new school after their prior school closes.													
3. Use other funds to cover the costs of revising transportation routes, transporting students to their new school, or making class assignments in a new school, are regular responsibilities an LEA carries out for all students and generally may not be paid for with SIG funds. However, an LEA may use SIG funds to cover these types of costs													

associated with its general responsibilities if the costs are directly attributable to the school closure and exceed the costs the LEA would have incurred in the absence of the closure.													
SCHOOL CLOSURE (CONTINUED, page 2)		JULY 2010	AUG 2010	SEPT 2010	OCT 2010	NOV 2010	DEC 2010	JAN 2011	FEB 2011	MARC H 2011	APRIL 2011	MAY 2011	JUNE 2011

NOTE: The school to which students who previously attended a closed school are sent should be located “within reasonable proximity” to the closed school. An LEA has discretion to determine which schools are located within a reasonable proximity to a closed school. A distance that is considered to be within a “reasonable proximity” in one LEA may not be within a “reasonable proximity” in another LEA, depending on the nature of the community. In making this determination, an LEA should consider whether students who would be required to attend a new school because of a closure would be unduly inconvenienced by having to travel to the new location. An LEA should also consider whether the burden on students could be eased by designating multiple schools as receiving schools.

An LEA should not eliminate school closure as an option simply because the higher-achieving schools that could be receiving schools are located at some distance from the closed school, so long as the distance is not unreasonable. Indeed, it is preferable for an LEA to send students who previously attended a closed school to a higher-achieving school that is located at some distance from, but still within reasonable proximity to, the closed school than to send those students to a lower-performing school that is geographically closer to the closed school. Moreover, an LEA should consider allowing parents to choose from among multiple higher-achieving schools, at least one of which is located within reasonable proximity to the closed school. By providing multiple school options, a parent could decide, for example, that it is worth having his or her child travel a longer distance in order to attend a higher-achieving school. Ultimately, the LEA’s goal should be to ensure that students who previously attended a closed school are able to enroll in the highest-performing school that can reasonably be offered as an alternative to the closed school

**TITLE I 1003(g) SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT APPLICATION
THREE YEAR BUDGET SUMMARY**

FROM: Date of Award TO: September 30, 2011	
51000 Employee Compensation	
52000 Employee Benefits	
53000 Professional and Technical Services	
54000 Property Services	
55000 Other Purchased Services	
56000 Supplies and Materials	
58000 Miscellaneous	
Subtotal	
60000 Indirect Costs	
57000 Property and Equipment	
Total	

FROM: October 1, 2011 TO: September 30, 2012	
51000 Employee Compensation	
52000 Employee Benefits	
53000 Professional and Technical Services	
54000 Property Services	
55000 Other Purchased Services	
56000 Supplies and Materials	
58000 Miscellaneous	
Subtotal	
60000 Indirect Costs	
57000 Property and Equipment	
Total	

FROM: October 1, 2012 TO: September 30, 2013	
51000 Employee Compensation	
52000 Employee Benefits	
53000 Professional and Technical Services	
54000 Property Services	
55000 Other Purchased Services	
56000 Supplies and Materials	
58000 Miscellaneous	
Subtotal	
60000 Indirect Costs	
57000 Property and Equipment	
Total	

TITLE I 1003(g) SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT APPLICATION
BUDGET COVER PAGE

PROJECT PERIOD: Date of Award

TO

30-Sep-11

DISTRICT :

APPLYING ON BEHALF OF THE FOLLOWING PERSISTENTLY LOWEST-ACHIEVING SCHOOLS:

Series	Budget
51000 Employee Compensation	\$0.00
52000 Employee Benefits	\$0.00
53000 Professional and Technical Services	\$0.00
54000 Property Services	\$0.00
55000 Other Purchased Services	\$0.00
56000 Supplies and Materials	\$0.00
58000 Miscellaneous	\$0.00
Subtotal	\$0.00
60000 Indirect Costs	
57000 Property and Equipment	\$0.00
Total	\$0.00

I hereby certify that, I have reviewed the information contained within this budget proposal and to the best of my knowledge, the information contained within is correct.

Signature of Finance or Business Manger

Date

TITLE I, 1003(g) School Improvement Funds Grant Application
Budget Detail: Employee Compensation (51000) and Benefits (52000)

Position	UCOA Code	FTE	Salaries 51000	Benefits 52000	Budget Justification and Cost Basis
Total		0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	

TITLE I, 1003(g) School Improvement Funds Grant Application
Budget Detail: Professional and Technical Services (53000)

Service	UCOA Code	Amount	Budget Justification and Cost Basis
Total		\$0.00	

TITLE I, 1003(g) School Improvement Funds Grant Application
Budget Detail: Property Services (54000)

[illegible]

TITLE I, 1003(g) School Improvement Funds Grant Application
Budget Detail: Other Purchased Service (55000)

[illegible]

TITLE I, 1003(g) School Improvement Funds Grant Application
Budget Detail: Supplies and Materials (56000)

[illegible]

TITLE I, 1003(g) School Improvement Funds Grant Application
Budget Detail: Miscellaneous (58000)

Item	UCOA Code	Amount	Budget Justification and Cost Basis
Total		\$0.00	

TITLE I, 1003(g) School Improvement Funds Grant Application
Budget Detail: Property and Equipment (57000)

[illegible]

TITLE I, 1003(g) School Improvement Funds Grant Application

School Matrix	
---------------	--

[illegible]